# Internal Review Form for “Studia Maritima”

The authors and reviewers are anonymous to each other (double-blind review process)

# When the review is negative or partially positive, the Reviewer is asked to justify his opinion in comments at the end of the form.

# TITLE OF THE ARTICLE:

#

#

# GENERAL EVALUATION (please mark the appropriate box):

1. The research article may be published:
	1. in the given form ☐
	2. after minor changes ☐
	3. after major changes ☐
2. The research article is not suitable for publication ☐

# CONTENT:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | YES | Requires MINORImprovements | Requires MAJOR Improvements | NO |
| 1 | Is the topic of the article consistent with “Studia Maritima” scientific profile? |  |  |  |  |
| Comments:………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………….…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………..………………………… |
| 2 | Is the article title formulated clearly and does it convey the content of the article? |  |  |  |  |
| Comments:…………………………………………………………………………………………….…………………………………………………..……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………..…………………………….………… |
| 3 | Is the work original? |  |  |  |  |
| Comments:…………………………………………………………………………………………………………….………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………..…………………………….………… |
| 4 | Is the subject matter significant? |  |  |  |  |
| Comments: ……………………………………………………………………………………………………………….…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………..…………………………….………… |
| 5 | Does the work presented in the article reflect the current state of knowledge? |  |  |  |  |
| Comments:…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………….…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………..…………………………….…………… |
| 6 | Is the cited literature well selected and utilized in the article?  |  |  |  |  |
| Comments:……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………….……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………..…………………………….……………………… |
| 7 | Are the methods, interpretations and conclusions correct? |  |  |  |  |
| Comments:…….…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………..……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………..…………………………….………… |

# FORM:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | YES | Requires MINORImprovements | Requires MAJORImprovements | N0 |
| 1 | Is the article well-constructed  |  |  |  |  |
| Comments: …………………………………………………………………………………………………………….…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………..…………………………….……… |
| 2 | Is the text clear and linguistically correct?  |  |  |  |  |
| Comments:………………………………………………………………………………………………………………….………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………..…………………………….……… |
| 3 | Does the text need to be shortened? If yes, which parts? |  |  |  |  |
| Comments:………………………………………………………………………………………………………………….……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………..…………………………….……………… |
| 4 | Is the additional material (tables/ graphs) appropriate and well prepared?  |  |  |  |  |
| Comments:………………………………………………………………………………………………………….…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………..…………………………….…… |
| 5 | Are the footnotes and bibliography edited correctly? |  |  |  |  |
| Comments:………………………………………………………………………………………………………….…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………..…………………………….……… |
| 6 | Do the abstract and summary convey the major themes of the scientific article?  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Comments:………………………………………………………………………………………………………….…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………..…………………………….…… |

If you have any particular comments for the author- required justification for partially positive and negative evaluations (please put them below, on the other side of the review or on a separate sheet of paper) ……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

*I hereby pledge that I will not use any knowledge about the content of the scientific article that has been reviewed prior to its publication in “Studia Maritima”.*

# Academic Degree/Title/Reviewer’s Name and Surname………………………………………………… …………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………..

**Affiliation**:……………………..………………………………………………………………………………………………….

 ................................................

 *Date and reviewer’s signature*