

A REVIEW FOR THE YEARBOOK OF UNWE

Reference № of the material (*completed by the editorial board*)

Title of the study (article):

Please assess the study (article) according to the following criteria:

Criterion	Mark (Choose from column 3)	Marks based on the criteria in column 1	Comments and recommendations (Remarks)
1	2	3	4
1. Scope of research		4 - Global 3 - Regional International 2 - National 1 - Regional Local	
2. Novelty of the problems examined in the paper		4 – Introduces new theoretical or practical problems 3 - Studies topical problems in theory/practice 2 - Studies problems that are not quite topical in theory/practice 1 - Studies problems that are not topical in theory/practice	
3. Originality of contributions		5 - Suggests a new solution to a new problem 4 - Suggests a new solution to existing problems 3 - Bridges a gap in theory/practice 2 - The suggested solutions do not differ from the ones provided or applied so far 1 - There are no contributions	
4. Correspondence between title and content		4 - High degree of correspondence 3 - Average degree of correspondence 2 - Low degree of correspondence 1 - Incongruity	
5. Logical structure and coherence of the exposition		4 - Logical structure and coherent exposition 3 - Logical structure and incoherent exposition 2 - Illogical structure and coherent exposition 1 - Illogical structure and an incoherent exposition	

6. Research methodology		4 – Appropriate and clearly presented 3 – Appropriate but not very clearly presented 2 – Not very appropriate 1 – Inappropriate	
7. Validity of the results		4 – High degree 3 – Average degree 2 – Low degree 1 – No validity	
8. Thesis proof		3 – Thesis proven 2 – Thesis partially proven 1 – Thesis not proved	
9. Applicability in practice		4 – High degree 3 – Average degree 2 – Low degree 1 – No relation to practice	
10. Findings and conclusions		5 – Valid and well-founded 4 – Valid but not well-founded 3 – Too general 2 – Superficial and unclear 1 – No conclusions	
11. Citation		5 – Correct, up-to-date bibliography 4 – Correct, outdated bibliography 3 – Incorrect, up-to-date bibliography 2 – Incorrect, outdated bibliography 1 – No citation	
12. Style		4 – Scientific and clear 3 – Scientific but not very clear 2 – Non-scientific but clear 1 – Non-scientific and not very clear (Concepts arbitrarily introduced and unclearly defined)	
Total quantitative mark of the article - total (column 2)			

Final mark (*Please underline the corresponding sentence*):

- The study (article) can be published without any changes;
- The study (article) can be published after minor revision;
- The study (article) can be published after major revisions, subject to a second review;
- I do not recommend the study (article) for publication because of the reasons given in the review.

Additional notes and recommendations for improvement:

Reviewer data (confidential):

Name and surname	
Academic position	
Academic degree	
Scientific area	
Affiliation	
Please send this form via e-mail to yearbook@unwe.bg	