

## Reviewer Form

The 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: [marta.hajdyla@ug.edu.pl](mailto:marta.hajdyla@ug.edu.pl)

|                    |
|--------------------|
| Title of paper     |
| Reviewer's name    |
| Affiliation        |
| Date and signature |

### 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                                          |
|  | 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**

|  |                       |
|--|-----------------------|
|  | excellent             |
|  | readable              |
|  | heterogeneous or poor |

**II FORM (conformity with the Studia Scandinavica requirements)**

**6. Paper title**

|  |                    |
|--|--------------------|
|  | sufficiently clear |
|  | needs modification |

**7. Abstract (in English)**

|  |                    |
|--|--------------------|
|  | sufficiently clear |
|  | needs modification |
|  | is missing         |

**8. Keyword list (in English)**

|  |                    |
|--|--------------------|
|  | sufficiently clear |
|  | needs modification |
|  | is missing         |

**9. Keyword list (language of the paper)**

|  |                    |
|--|--------------------|
|  | sufficiently clear |
|  | needs modification |
|  | is missing         |

**10. Figures, tables, etc.**

|  |                          |
|--|--------------------------|
|  | correct and illustrative |
|  | need modification        |

**11. References**

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

### III CONCLUSION

#### 12. Contents evaluation

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

#### 13. 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

