

Reviewer Form

Reviewer is asked to fill in the form electronically (by entering X or + in the box before the appropriate choice). Longer commentary and explanations should be supplied in a separate section at the very end of this form.

Submissions are reviewed blindly by (at least) two referees. The author will receive their opinions anonymously. The filled-in form should be sent as an e-mail attachment at: finkw@univ.gda.pl

Title of paper	
Date	

I CONTENTS

1. Presentation of the problem/subject

	is clear
	needs addition or clarification
	is unclear

2. Theoretical background

	the author has an original point of view
	there is sufficient reference to prior studies
	insufficient reference to prior studies, list of references needs supplementation
	is unclear

3. Information presented

	is novel
	contributes to available knowledge
	repeats what is known already
	is unclear

4. Treatment of the problem/subject and analysis of the results is

	(very) well argued and generalized
	sufficiently argued and generalized
	insufficiently argued and generalized, needs revision
	vague, no generalization
	descriptive (analysis has not been the aim)

5. Language use and writing style is generally

THE REVIEWER IS NOT A NATIVE SPEAKER OF ENGLISH

	excellent
	readable
	heterogeneous or poor

II FORM (conformity with the *Studia Rossica Gedanensia* requirements)

6. Paper title

	sufficiently clear
	needs modification: <i>COMMUNITY</i> is associated first of all with its' sociological meaning, so it is very difficult to understand from the title what is the paper about

7. Abstract (in English)

	sufficiently clear
	needs modification
	is missing

8. Keyword list (in English)

	sufficiently clear
	needs modification
	is missing

9. Abstract (in Polish or Russian)

	sufficiently clear
	needs modification
	is missing

10. Keyword list (Polish or Russian)

	sufficiently clear
	needs modification
	is missing

11. Figures, tables, etc.

	are acceptable
	need modification – titles, at least

12. References

	acceptable
	references in the text need correction
	list of references needs correction

III CONCLUSION

13. Contents evaluation

	PUBLISH AS IS
	ACCEPTABLE with minor modifications
	MIGHT BE ACCEPTED after major modifications (and, if necessary, after another round of reviewing)
	UNACCEPTABLE

14. Form evaluation

	ACCEPTABLE without major modifications
	NEEDS IMPROVEMENT (as indicated in part II)
	needs shortening

REVIEWER'S COMMENTARY for the editorial board

REVIEWER'S COMMENTARY for the author of the paper