Peer Reviewer Manuscript Evaluation Form

Article Code: _____ / _____

Title of Manuscript: _____

_____

A) QUALITY ASSESSMENT

1. Does this paper present new ideas or results that have not been previously published?

   [ ]Yes   [ ]No

2. Are the results/ideas presented in this paper important enough for publication?

   [ ]Yes   [ ]No

3. Is the paper technically correct?   [ ]Yes   [ ]No

4. Are the conclusions and interpretations valid and are they supported by the data?

   [ ]Yes   [ ]No

5. Is the article clear and comprehensible?   [ ]Yes   ]No

6. Please choose one of the following:

   [ ] Q1 Exceptional work – makes a major contribution to the advancement of the subject (falls within the top 10% of papers in the field)

   [ ] Q2 Good quality work - significant, novel, interesting, and influential

   [ ] Q3 Borderline work – correct but of low interest, unlikely to have an impact

   [ ] Q4 Low quality work – adds little or no new knowledge to the field

   [ ] Q5 Poor work – not free from basic errors and/or faulty judgments

7. Does this paper address a subject of current interest?   [ ]Yes   [ ]No

8. In your opinion, will the paper be cited by others?   [ ]Yes   [ ]No

B) MANUSCRIPT ASSESSMENT

Relevance for the overall aim of the Journal and for the current Call for Papers

Observations and recommendations concerning the **literature review** (is the literature review comprehensive and up-to-date? Is the literature review clearly related to research questions and hypotheses? Are there other relevant publications which should be included in the literature review?)

Observations and recommendations concerning the **methodology and data** (is the research methodology clearly presented? Are methodological limitations discussed? Is it clear how were the data produced and analyzed? Is the methodology for producing data correct? Is the methodology for data analysis adequate?)

Observations and recommendations concerning the **results, conclusions and discussions** (are results clearly supported by data? are conclusions related to the theoretical discussion and to research results as well? Is there a tendency towards over-generalization, or over/under-interpretation?)

Observations and recommendations concerning the **article structure**, and the overall **clarity of writing** and **argumentation**:

Other observations and assessment:

C) RECOMMENDATIONS

For the Editors:

☐	Accept for publication as it is
☐	Accept for publication with minor revisions
☐	Revise and resubmit
☐	Reject

Comments to the author(s)

Thank you very much for your time, effort and contribution