REVIEW FORM

Dear Sirs,

As part of our ongoing commitment to the high standards of the scientific works published by, a member of the Association of University Presses, we are turning to you with a kind request to prepare a clear and succinct review of the submitted manuscript. Scientific publications have to be reviewed by a community of experts to guarantee that they meet the highest standards.

In part III of the questionnaire, please feel free to comment on any scientific and editing issues, and indicate any fragments that need to be revised, modified or removed. Your valuable comments will enable the Journal to improve the quality of its publications and reach the right audience.

Editor's full name and title of publication

Evaluation criteria

The decision to accept the work for publication will be based on the opinions expressed in point III (Final evaluation).

I. GENERAL EVALUATION

	Overall concept			
	(Is the overall concept of the monograph clearly presented? Does the monograph contain an introduction from the			
1.	editor/scientific editor which presents the scientific concept and the criteria for selecting scientific articles?)			
2.	Selection of articles			
	(Are the articles relevant to the presented concept? Is each article closely related to the subject matter of the			
	monograph? Do the articles form a cohesive whole or are they only a collection of random statements?)			

3.	Selection of authors			
	(Is the selection of authors relevant to the publication? Are the authors' research experiences relevant to the scient concept?)			
4.	Scientific and language editing			
4.	(Is the monograph consistent in terms of methodology, scientific content, terminology, language and style?)			
	, 3, 3, , ,			
	Structure and content			
5.	(Are the monograph's structure and the sequence of articles consistent with the scientific concept?)			
6.	Completeness and correctness of source materials			
0.	(complete, adequate and correct references, footnotes and citations; correct citation format in			
	footnotes and references)			
	jobinotes una rejerences)			
7.	Relevance of research, rationale behind research, original research hypotheses			
/.				
	(The authors are familiar with and make references to the current state of research in the area of study)			

8.	Suspected plagiarism or self-plagiarism (Similarity to previously published content; absence of in-text citations or references to sources for paraphrased information)		
	ingormationy		

II EVALUATION OF ARTICLES

Remarks concerning articles in a monograph written by multiple authors. Please evaluate each article separately by copying the below table for every article. Include the title of each article.

TITLE OF ARTICLE:

No.	EVALUATED ASPECTS	EVALUATION	TICK THE RELEVANT
1	The article is relevant to the subject matter of the	YES	вох
1.	entire monograph	NO NO	
		PARTLY	
2.	The article makes a contribution to the respective field of science	SIGNIFICANT	
۷.		SATISFACTORY	
		UNSATISFACTORY	
3.	Research methodology is appropriate	NOVEL	
3.		SATISFACTORY	
		UNSATISFACTORY	
4.	Analytical reasoning is clear	OUTSTANDING	
7.	6 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	SATISFACTORY	
		UNSATISFACTORY (UNCLEAR)	
5.	Scientific content and language meet editing requirements	SATISFACTORY	
J.		UNSATISFACTORY	
6.	Literature review	EXHAUSTIVE	
		SATISFACTORY	
		UNSATISFACTORY	
7.	DESCRIPTIVE REMARKS		

	III. SUMMARY AND FINAL EVALUATION	
	Final evaluation	
	Please tick the appropriate box	1 -
Α	Accept in its present form	
В	Accept after the following (minor or major) revisions have been made:	
С	Revise and resubmit for re-review	
D	Reject	
	 Date and the R	eviewer's signature

Monograph written by multiple authors, conference proceedings