PEER-REVIEW OF A BOOK REVIEW 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 or/and the title of the reviewed book:

2. The peer-reviewer’s competence. Is the peer-reviewer familiar with the areas of research referred to in the manuscript [tick appropriate]: [ ] YES, CLOSELY  [ ] YES, GENERALLY  [ ] NO

THEMES AND FIELDS:

3. The significance of the theme of the reviewed book for AVANT journal [tick appropriate]:
   [ ] poor  [ ] average  [ ] large

4. Originality and innovation of the content discussed in the book. 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)

5. Interdisciplinarity (What areas does the book represent?):

THE REALIZATION:

6. The general realization [tick appropriate]:
   6.1. Is the structure of the book review clear and coherent? [ ] YES  [ ] NO
   6.2. Is the structure of the book review appropriate for its aims? [ ] YES  [ ] NO
   6.3. Is the book review written in compliance with editorial instructions for book reviews? [ ] YES  [ ] NO
7. The originality of realization of the book review [tick appropriate]:
[ ] zero  
[ ] low  
[ ] average  
[ ] high [concerns AN ESSAY REVIEWS and A DISCUSSIONS, doesn't concern STANDARD REVIEWS]

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

9. Evaluation of the technical-formal skill level [select appropriate]:
[ ] poor  [ ] average  [ ] good

10. Evaluation of the linguistic skill level [select appropriate]:
[ ] poor  [ ] average  [ ] good

11. Any suggestions for the author (e.g. tips for improving the book review):

OPINION:

12. The manuscript should be [select appropriate]:
[ ] accepted without changes  
[ ] accepted after minor amendments  
[ ] accepted after larger corrections  
[ ] rejected with a possibility of resubmission for publication  
[ ] rejected