

DOUBLE-ANONYMISED PEER REVIEW FORM

for manuscripts submitted to the journal
UNESCO Chair Journal "Lifelong Professional Education in the XXI Century"

Reviewer code		Manuscript code	
Date of review		Review round	<input type="checkbox"/> first <input type="checkbox"/> repeated <input type="checkbox"/> additional
Manuscript type	<input type="checkbox"/> research article <input type="checkbox"/> review article	<input type="checkbox"/> theoretical / conceptual <input type="checkbox"/> other: _____	

Manuscript title (language of submission)	
Manuscript title (in English)	

Important. The reviewer assesses the manuscript in line with the journal's Peer Review Policy. For review, theoretical, or conceptual articles, criteria related to empirical data are applied only to the extent that they are relevant to the manuscript type.

1. Reviewer declaration

I confirm that I have sufficient academic expertise to assess this manuscript.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
I confirm the absence of any actual, potential, or perceived significant conflict of interest.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
I undertake to keep confidentiality and not disclose the content of the manuscript to third parties.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
I confirm that I can provide a reasoned review within the set time.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
I agree to follow the journal's policies on academic integrity, review ethics, and editorial communication.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes

2. Assessment scale

High level	fully meets the criterion; the manuscript is prepared well, consistently, and without major comments.
Satisfactory level	generally meets the criterion; there are some minor weaknesses that do not change the overall academic quality of the manuscript.
Needs revision	the criterion is met only partly; important clarification, correction, or strengthening of some elements is needed.
Does not meet	the criterion is not met or is met improperly; the weakness has a significant effect on the quality of the manuscript.

3. Main assessment criteria

Criterion	High level	Satisfactory level	Needs revision	Does not meet
1. Relevance to the journal's subject area and scope.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Relevance, scientific novelty and/or significance of the manuscript.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Clarity of the research problem, aim, and logic of the manuscript structure.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Soundness of the methodology, methods, and research design (if applicable).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Quality of the theoretical basis, source base, and academic dialogue with previous studies.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Validity of the results, depth of analysis and discussion, and validity of the conclusions.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Practical, educational, scientific, or managerial relevance of the results (where applicable).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. Language, academic style, logic of presentation, and overall quality of the text presentation.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. Compliance with the journal's technical requirements, APA style, and the correctness of the references.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

4. Academic integrity, ethics, and procedural concerns

Question	Yes	No	Short explanation (if needed)
1. Were any signs of plagiarism, self-plagiarism, or excessive text overlap found?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
2. Are there any signs of fabrication, falsification, or methodologically unreliable presentation of results?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
3. Was any potential conflict of interest found that was not declared by the author(s)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
4. Does the manuscript contain signs of manipulative, irrelevant, or coercive citation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

5. Strengths of the manuscript (required)

6. Main comments and weaknesses that need to be addressed (required)

7. Specific recommendations to the author for revision (required)

8. Confidential comments for the editorial office (if needed)

9. Reviewer's recommendation

<input type="checkbox"/>	Accept without changes.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Accept subject to minor revisions.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Return for major revisions and repeat consideration by the editorial office.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Send for an additional / repeated review round after major revisions.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Reject.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other (please specify if needed): _____

Note. The reviewer's recommendation is advisory. The final editorial decision is made by the journal's editorial office on the basis of at least two independent reviews, the content of expert comments, and the manuscript's compliance with the journal's policies.

Date of review completion	
Internal editorial note	