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The second stage of evaluation: external peer-review

**REFEREEING TEMPLATE FOR PAPERS SUBMITTED TO *NEOFILOLOG* (EXTERNAL PEER-REVIEW)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Article number |  |
| Article Title |  |
| Reviewer's name and surname |  |
| The date of receiving the paper for a review |  |
| The date of sending a review |  |

**Article form:** [ ]  **research review** [ ]  **research report** [ ]  **other**

1. **ITEMS TO BE EVALUATED (CRITERIA GRID)** (Mark one of the options with "**X**")

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **L.P.** | **CRITERIA GRID** | **Yes** | **No** | **With reservations** |
| **Title and abstract evaluation** |
| 1. | Does the title reflect the content of the article? |[ ] [ ] [ ]
| 2. | Does the abstract and keywords reflect the content of the article? |[ ] [ ] [ ]
| 3. | Is the aim of the article described in the abstract/introduction? |[ ] [ ] [ ]
| **Structure, language and editing style evaluation** |
| 4. | Are the aims announced in the introduction satisfactorily met? |[ ] [ ] [ ]
| 5. | Does the article have a clearly defined research aim, well described research methodology and major hypotheses as well as conclusions? |[ ] [ ] [ ]
| 6. | Is the content of the article`s structured coherently and forms a comprehensive unity? |[ ] [ ] [ ]
| 7. | Is the article written in an academic register and discourse? |[ ] [ ] [ ]
| 8. | Has the article been edited according to the guidelines provided for the authors on the Journal website? |[ ] [ ] [ ]
| 9. | Are the illustrations ( tables, pictures, graphs etc.) legible, do they have titles and reference source? |[ ] [ ] [ ]
| 10. | Are the illustration included in the article (tables, pictures, graphs) adequately explained in the text? |[ ] [ ] [ ]
| 11. | Does the article end with a summary? |[ ] [ ] [ ]
| **L.P.** | **CRITERIA GRID** | **Yes** | **No** | **With reservations** |
| **Content Evaluation**  |
| 12. | Is the content of the article proper and to date with the contemporary knowledge?  |[ ] [ ] [ ]
| 13. | Does the article make any development of a scientific nature? |[ ] [ ]  [ ]  |
| 14. | Is the problem presented in the paper contextualized and argued well enough? |  |  |  |
| 15. | Does the article promote a new approach to the problem? |[ ] [ ] [ ]
| 16. | Is the description of research methodology, if present in the text, correct and exhaustive?  |[ ] [ ] [ ]
| 17. | Does the content carry a didactic value? |[ ] [ ] [ ]
| **Evaluation of quoting and reference style** |
| 18. | Is the article an original scientific paper (does not constitute a compilation of previous, well-known studies)? |[ ] [ ] [ ]
| 19. | Is the article supported by the latest scientific literature of the subject? |[ ] [ ] [ ]
| 20. | Is the quoted literature properly chosen and sufficient? |[ ] [ ] [ ]
| 21. | Is quoting style precise and in accordance with the Journal guidelines? |[ ] [ ] [ ]

1. **FINAL EVALUATION OF THE ARTICLE**

|  |
| --- |
| I grade the article as follows (Mark one of the options with "**X**"): |
|  [ ]  1 – it should be published;  |
|  [ ]  2 – it should be published with the amendments suggested; |
|  [ ]  3 – it should be rewritten and resubmitted; |
|  [ ]  4 – it should be rejected. |

1. **SPECIFIC COMMENTS**

Please specify in the case when you select "**with reservations**" to any of the categories of assessment in the first part (according to the example: Re: 1.; Re: 2.; Re: 3.; etc.)

|  |
| --- |
|  |