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(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