

CATALLAXY

EVALUATION FORM

Article title:

Substantive assessment

1. Is the aim of the article clearly defined?

poorly (0 pts)

acceptably (1 pt)

satisfactorily (2 pts)

thoroughly (3 pts)

2. Is the article a valuable contribution to a specific area of research?

poor (0 pts)

adequate (1 pt)

relevant (2 pts)

very important (3 pts)

3. Are the applied research methods clearly defined?

poorly (0 pts)

acceptably (1 pt)

satisfactorily (2 pts)

thoroughly (3 pts)

4. Are the research methods adapted to the aim of the article?

poorly (0 pts)

acceptably (1 pt)

satisfactorily (2 pts)

precisely (3 pts)

5. Is the selection of literature accurate and current?

poor (0 pts)

adequate (1 pt)

proper (2 pts)

very accurate (3 pts)

6. Is the selection of empirical material accurate and current?

poor (0 pts)

adequate (1 pt)

proper (2 pts)

very accurate (3 pts)

7. Are the research results clearly defined?

poorly (0 pts)

acceptably (1 pt)

satisfactorily (2 pts)

thoroughly (3 pts)

8. Do conclusions correspond with the content of the article?

poorly (0 pts)

acceptably (1 pt)

satisfactorily (2 pts)

completely (3 pts)

9. Do conclusions constitute the author's own contribution?

negative (0 pts)

to minor extent (1 pt)

to major extent (2 pts)

completely (3 pts)



Formal assessment

10. Is the title of the article and its sections formulated correctly and adequately to the content?

poorly (0 pts)	acceptably (1 pt)	satisfactorily (2 pts)	totally (3 pts)
----------------	-------------------	------------------------	-----------------

11. Is the structure of the article right?

poor (0 pts)	acceptable (1 pt)	proper (2 pts)	very accurate (3 pts)
--------------	-------------------	----------------	-----------------------

12. Is the technique of presenting someone else's achievements (citations, bibliography) correct?

poor (0 pts)	acceptable (1 pt)	mostly correct (2 pts)	fully correct (3 pts)
--------------	-------------------	------------------------	-----------------------

13. Do tables and charts adequately present empirical material?

poorly (0 pts)	acceptably (1 pt)	satisfactorily (2 pts)	absolutely (3 pts)
----------------	-------------------	------------------------	--------------------

14. Is the terminology of the paper well-suited to scientific article?

poorly (0 pts)	acceptably (1 pt)	satisfactorily (2 pts)	very well (3 pts)
----------------	-------------------	------------------------	-------------------

Total number of points

Comments and suggestions

Recommendation

(33–42 pts)	Publish, no significant changes to the content of the article are suggested.
(22–32 pts)	Publish after considering the comments indicated in the review.
(11–21 pt)	Reject, it is suggested to make significant changes and re-review the article.
(0–10 pts)	Reject, the paper does not meet standards for a scientific article.

Date

Name and last name of the reviewer (*this field will not be disclosed to the author*)

Signature (*this field will not be disclosed to the author*)