

Guidelines for Reviewers

Reviewer:

Manuscript title:

1. Is the manuscript suitable for publishing?

Your comments:

- Yes, without changes
- Yes, with minor modifications
- Yes, but with essential changes
- No

2. Does the title correspond to the contents of the paper? *Your comments:*

- Yes
- No

3. The manuscript represents:

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="radio"/> Theoretical contemplation | <input type="radio"/> Empirical information |
| <input type="radio"/> Application | <input type="radio"/> Critical survey |
| <input type="radio"/> General review | <input type="radio"/> Know-how |
| <input type="radio"/> Case study | <input type="radio"/> Other |

4. How would you evaluate the potential benefits of the manuscript in practice?

- Low
- Fair
- High

5. Could the manuscript be considered as a new and original (scientific/professional) contribution?

- Yes
- No

6. Is the manuscript written clearly and explicitly?

Your comments:

- Yes
- No

7. Are there any factual or logical mistakes?

Your comments:

- Yes
- No

8. Should the manuscript be extended or reduced?

- Yes
- No

If the manuscript should be modified in either manner, please note your suggestions, especially if you recommend reducing the manuscript, as not to lessen its scientific/professional value:

9. Are all the examples, illustrations and tables necessary and acceptable ?

Your comments:

- Yes
- No

10. Are the references contemporary and relevant?

Your comments:

- Yes
- No

11. Does the abstract offer enough information?

Your comments:

- Yes
- No

12. How would you assess the category of the manuscript:

- Scientific paper
- Preliminary communication
- Review
- Presentation (report)
- Case study
- Other

13. We kindly ask you to state other notes and suggestions that you consider necessary. Please mark in the manuscript suggestions for minor text corrections or modifications.

Date:

Reviewer: