**REVIEW FORM**

**REVIEWER’S NAME:**

**REVIEWER’S E-MAIL:**

**PAPER’S TITLE:**

**DATE:**

**MANUSCRIPT RATING**

*The questions below are intended to help the reviewers to produce a WELL-EVIDENCED REPORT. Please answer the questions below.*

1. Does the paper fit the stated scope of the journal?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| N/A | unsatisfactory | poor | acceptable | good | excellent |  |

2. Is the paper an original comparative study (not a compilation of formerly known publications); does it contain sufficient new findings?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| N/A | unsatisfactory | poor | acceptable | good | excellent |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

3. Does the paper’s title match its content?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| N/A | unsatisfactory | poor | acceptable | good | excellent |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

4. Are the keywords and the abstract sufficiently informative? Is the aim in the abstract and introduction clearly specified?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| N/A | unsatisfactory | poor | acceptable | good | excellent |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

5. Does the content of the paper justify its length? Is the research rigorous as to methodology and conceptualisation?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| N/A | unsatisfactory | poor | acceptable | good | excellent |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

6. Is the paper well-organized?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| N/A | unsatisfactory | poor | acceptable | good | excellent |

7. Does the paper have conclusions that logically stem from the content?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| N/A | unsatisfactory | poor | acceptable | good | excellent |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

8. Is the bibliography sufficient and up-to-date?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| N/A | unsatisfactory | poor | acceptable | good | excellent |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

9. Is the paper written in good academic English?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| N/A | unsatisfactory | poor | acceptable | good | excellent |

**REVIEWER’S GENERAL RECOMMENDATION:**

|  |
| --- |
| The article can be printed in the “Journal of Comparative Studies” **without any corrections**. |
| The article can be printed in the “Journal of Comparative Studies” **with minor** **corrections**.  The article can be printed in the “Journal of Comparative Studies” **with major** **corrections**. |
| The article **cannot be printed** in the “Journal of Comparative Studies” as failing to meet the requirements for a scientific paper/ it is outside the stated scope of the journal. |
|  |

**REVIEWER’S COMMENTS FOR AUTHORS**

*Please write a WELL-EVIDENCED REPORT, explain the reason(s) for accepting or rejecting the paper. Expand on any weak areas in the checklist and offer specific advice on how the author(s) may improve the quality of their paper.*