



PEER-REVIEW OF A MANUSCRIPT OF INTRODUCTION 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 (one/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