



**PEER-REVIEW OF A MANUSCRIPT SUBMITTED  
FOR CONSIDERATION FOR PUBLICATION IN AVANT. THE JOURNAL  
OF THE PHILOSOPHICAL-INTERDISCIPLINARY VANGUARD**

(the form below is intended to help peer reviewers critique a manuscript)

---

GENERAL INFORMATION:

**1. The title of the manuscript:**

**2. A summary of the manuscript (a few sentences):**

**3. The peer-reviewer's competence. Is the peer-reviewer familiar with the areas of research referred to in the article [tick appropriate]:**  YES, CLOSELY  YES, GENERALLY  NO

---

THEMES AND FIELDS:

**4. The significance of the themes of the text for AVANT journal [tick appropriate]:**

poor  average  large

**5. Originality and innovation of the content discussed in the text. Is its level [tick appropriate]:**

zero (referenced concepts or research results do not bring anything new / have only historical significance)

low (referenced concepts / research results at the moment have some importance in the field)

medium (referenced concepts / research results are moderately original in the field)

high (referenced concepts / research results are important for the entire field / cross-disciplinary)

very high (referenced concepts / research results entail redefining the field /area of study)

**6. Interdisciplinarity and specification (What areas does the text represent? Is the text directed to a rather narrow group of specialists?)**

---

THE REALIZATION:

**7. The general realization [tick appropriate]:**

**7.1. Does the title clearly define the purpose?**  YES  NO

**7.2. Is the structure of the text clear and coherent?**  YES  NO

**7.3. Is the structure of the text appropriate for its aims?**  YES  NO



**8. The descriptive rating of the structure of the work:**

**9. The originality of approach** [tick appropriate]:

- zero or low** (e.g. mechanical summary, classic review, one of many similar surveys of the topic)
- average** (e.g. exceptional accuracy and comprehensiveness of implementation, skilful selection of less important issues, particularly valuable bibliography)
- high** (e.g. realization of an original idea, important comments or propositions relevant for the discussed topic/text, including aspects/examples not taken into account yet)

**10. Assessment of terminology and its compliance with applicable standards** [select appropriate]:  invalid  correct  minor reservations (please specify):

**11. Evaluation of the technical-formal skill level** [select appropriate]:

- poor  average  good

**12. Evaluation of the linguistic skill level** [select appropriate]:

- poor  average  good

**13. Any suggestions for the author (e.g. tips for improving the text):**

---

OPINION:

**14. The text should be** [select appropriate]:

- accepted without changes**
- accepted after minor amendments**
- accepted after larger corrections**
- rejected with a possibility of resubmission for publication**
- rejected**