Evaluation Form

Religious and Sacred Poetry : An International Quarterly of Religion, Culture and Education 2/4, 273-274

2014

[In English]

Evaluation Form

Religious and Sacred Poetry: An International Quarterly of Religion, Culture and Education

CODE of the reviewed article (identification details, including author's name, affiliation, title, and rank are encoded and known only to the editorial board up to the time of publication, because of the double-blind review process) ....

Title of the reviewed article (text) ....

Topic of the reviewed article (text) ....

The review of the article

Rank/title, first name and surname of the reviewer: ....

1. Table of evaluation according to the criteria

The criteria of evaluation for the text review and the assessement of coherence between the text and the criteria:	Very weak	Marginal	Acceptable	Good	Excellent
1. Coherence with the profile of the journal					
2. Originality (does the text contain new, important research statements or results, or new, significant information)					
3. Quality of scholarly methodology (research methodology, application of proper methods for research and the principles of publishing scholarly texts)					
4. Practical applicalibity					
5. Completeness (are all elements of the scholarly text present)					
6. Comprehension by the reader (is the text coherent and logical)					
7. Quality of references and documentation (footnotes)					
8. Structure and style of presentation [organization of material and style of presentation]					
9. Clarity/quality of tables, diagrams					
10. Relevance or topicality of the subject					

Implications: Does the text correctly identify its implications for further scholarly research, theoretical or practical solutions, or social development?	
Does the text reveal or illustrate a connection between theory and practice?	
Can this text be used in practical education, further research, utilizing the input of the article?	
Are the research results presented in the text coherent with the research issues?	

2. RECOMMENDATION

Recommendation/Quality of the article: (please mark only one answer)

ACCEPT WITHOUT REVISIONS (recommended unconditionally)	
Accept **after minor** editorial revisions (recommended with some revisions – text fails several criteria)	
Accept **after serious** revisions (another review required) (not recommended, text shows promise but does not fulfill the criteria in its current form) REJECT WITH POSSIBILITY OF REVISION AND RESUBMISSION	
REJECT (text does not fulfill the criteria)	

signature of the reviewer (or a sign): ....

3. JUSTIFICATION

....

....

....

[Scholarly value of the reviewed text (no more than 600 characters)]

4. Comments on particular points (1-10) of the criteria:

1. ....
2. ....
3. ....
4. ....
5. ....
6. ....
7. ....
8. ....
9. ....
10. ....

[no more than 600 characters]

....

Legible signature of the Reviewer

Place.., date .... (dd.mm.yyyy)