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Review Form for Papers Submitted to the journal

Notes:

1. Please mark the chosen evaluation by using the mark “X”

2. Your notes, remarks and suggestions to the author/ s should by written in the grey part. All remarks should be brief, straightforward and comprehensible.

3. Review form should be returned to the executive editor in electronic form (the preferred format is MS Word, .doc and .docx documents) via email at: [ondrej.hamulak@upol.cz](mailto:ondrej.hamulak@upol.cz)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Title of the Paper:** | | |
| **Topic** | original |  |
| partially original |  |
| topic not original, but originally elaborated |  |
| insufficiently original |  |
| **Notes and suggestions of the reviewer:** | | |
| **Content** | excellent – the paper is a high-quality contribution to the expert discourse on the topic |  |
| good – the paper properly contributes to the expert discourse on the topic |  |
| sufficient – the paper is a generalisation of research outcomes on the topic |  |
| insufficient – the paper does not fulfil basic requirements for a research work |  |
| **Notes and suggestions of the reviewer** (optional)**:** | | |
| **Expert level** | high – the paper has no content deficiencies and the author shows a good comprehension of the topic |  |
| good – the paper has no content deficiencies and the author shows a good orientation in the topic |  |
| sufficient - the paper has no content deficiencies. The paper has controversial statements, but the author supports them with one’s own argumentation |  |
| insufficient – the paper has content insufficiencies and is not in line with present state of positive law or research on the topic |  |
| **Notes and suggestions of the reviewer** (optional)**:** | | |
| **Formal level (language and style used, bibliography)** | excellent |  |
| good |  |
| sufficient |  |
| insufficient |  |
| **Notes and suggestions of the reviewer** (optional)**:** | | |
| **Overall evaluation of the paper by the reviewer** | I recommend the paper for publication in ICLR |  |
| I do not recommend the paper for publication in ICLR |  |
| I recommend the paper for publication in ICLR with reservations stated in notes and suggestions above |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Date, name, affiliation of the reviewer** (in case of communication the review to the author/s this section will be deleted): |