

Reviewer Report Form

1. General Information

Manuscript ID: _____

Article Title: _____

Journal Section: _____

Date manuscript received: _____

Date review submitted: _____

2. Evaluation of the Abstract and Keywords

2.1. Abstract

(Structure, informativeness, alignment with the article content)

Rating: ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

(1 = very poor, 5 = excellent)

Comments and recommendations:

2.2. Keywords

(Relevance, terminological accuracy, search potential)

Rating: ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

(1 = very poor, 5 = excellent)

Comments:

3. Evaluation of Research Methodology

(Research design, justification of methods, sample, instruments, and data analysis)

Rating: ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

(1 = very poor, 5 = excellent)

Main comments and recommendations:

-
-
- ☐ Methodology is sufficiently justified
 - ☐ Requires clarification / revision
 - ☐ Methodological shortcomings are substantial
-

4. Evaluation of Scientific Merit and Research Results

(Originality of ideas, validity of results, and quality of interpretation)

Rating: ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

(1 = very poor, 5 = excellent)

Comments:

5. Evaluation of Conclusions

(Alignment with research objectives, logical coherence, scientific contribution, and practical implications)

Rating: ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

(1 = very poor, 5 = excellent)

Comments and recommendations:

- ☐ Conclusions fully correspond to the results
 - ☐ Conclusions are partially declarative
 - ☐ Conclusions do not reflect the obtained results
-

6. Compliance with Formatting Requirements

(Structure, language quality, tables and figures, style, and compliance with journal guidelines)

Rating: ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

(1 = very poor, 5 = excellent)

Identified issues (if applicable):

- ☐ Requirements fully met
 - ☐ Minor technical revisions required
 - ☐ Significant formatting violations
-

7. Evaluation of the Reference List

7.1. Completeness and relevance of sources

(Recency, international context, relevance)

Rating: ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

(1 = very poor, 5 = excellent)

7.2. Formatting of References

(APA style, DOI availability, and accuracy of citations)

Rating: ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

(1 = very poor, 5 = excellent)

Comments:

-
- ☐ The share of recent / international sources is sufficient
 - ☐ The literature review should be expanded
 - ☐ There are issues with reference formatting
-

8. Strengths of the Article

(Please identify the main strengths of the manuscript.)

9. Major Comments and Recommendations

(Major issues requiring revision or clarification)

10. Additional Comments

(Style, terminology, structure, language, or minor issues.)

11. Ethical Aspects (if applicable)

- ☐ No violations identified
- ☐ Potential ethical concerns identified (please specify):

12. Final Recommendation of the Reviewer

- ☐ Accept
- ☐ Minor revisions required
- ☐ Major revisions required
- ☐ Reject

Justification of the decision:

13. Confidential Comments to the Editor

(These comments will not be shared with the author.)
