

1. Thematic relevance for the journal

How much does the paper discuss or employ the main topic of the journal?

- 1 – Not at all
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5 – Very much

2. Originality and level of innovativeness

Is the description of the state-of-the-art based on clear references?

Are research questions clearly and explicitly stated?

Are the conclusions supported by the research data?

Do you have alternative interpretations of the considered research data?

- 1 – Poor
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5 – High

3. General quality of the content

Is the title appropriate and in correct English?

Is the abstract a concise description of the work and conclusions?

Is the introduction a satisfactory background to the work?

Can parts of the paper be presented more concisely?

Are the research results adequately described and analysed?

- 1 – Poor
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5 – High

4. Quality of presentation

Does the paper formatting fully match the journals' template?

Is the usage of English language acceptable?

Is the analysis of images and graphs acceptable?

- 1 – Poor
- 2

- 3
- 4
- 5 – High

5. Structure of the content

Is the arrangement of material satisfactory?

Is the structure well reflected by the formatting?

Are all references correctly cited in the text by a number in brackets [23]?

Is the list of references at the end of the paper complete?

Is the numbering of figures and tables correct?

- Yes
- No

6. References

Are the references used in this articles appropriate and updated?

- 1 – Not at all
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5 – Very much

7. Detailed remarks

Please write down detailed remarks providing evidence for your answers to the questions 1-6 above (please answer to as many questions as you can).

8. Based on your detailed review, what is the paper significance for theory and practice?

- 1 – Not significant at all
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5 – Very significant

9. Do you consider yourself:

- 1 – Interested in this topic
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5 – An expert on this topic