

STUDIA HISTORIAE SCIENTIARUM: PEER REVIEW FORM

IDENTIFICATION NUMBER: *Stud. Hist. Sci.* –

TITLE OF THE ARTICLE:

PEER REVIEWER:

(first name and surname; scientific degree/title)

.....

(scientific unit where the reviewer is employed)

I agree / disagree (strike where inapplicable) that my name along with affiliation, ORCID, homepage URL and URL of social media websites (strike where inapplicable) will appear on the public list of Peer Reviewers working with the *Studia Historiae Scientiarum* (this applies to a specific volume/yearbook).

.....

Date

.....

*Signature**

**Notice:* A completed review form without a handwritten signature sent by email is deemed to be signed.

STUDIA HISTORIAE SCIENTIARUM: PEER REVIEW FORM

IDENTIFICATION NUMBER: *Stud. Hist. Sci.* –

TITLE OF THE ARTICLE:

1. GENERAL EVALUATION OF THE ARTICLE

No.	CRITERIA – QUESTIONS	ANSWERS <i>Possible variations: 'YES', 'TO A GREAT EXTENT', 'TO A LITTLE EXTENT', 'NO'</i>
1	<i>Does the abstract summarize the content of the article in a clear and concise manner?</i>	
2	<i>Have the keywords been chosen correctly?</i>	
3	<i>Is the purpose of the article clearly stated and has it been achieved?</i>	
4	<i>Have the research methods been determined and are they appropriate for the aim of the research?</i>	
5	<i>Does the study introduce a new approach to the subject matter and contributes to the development of the history of science?</i>	
6	<i>Has the study been correctly organized and internally structured?</i>	
7	<i>Is the content of the study clearly presented?</i>	
8	<i>Is the selection of the sources and the literature complete?</i>	
9	<i>Is the study written correctly in its formal aspect (i.e. linguistic correctness, style, footnotes, bibliography)?</i>	

STUDIA HISTORIAE SCIENTIARUM: PEER REVIEW FORM

2. COPYRIGHT *(strike where inapplicable)*

The article bears the signs of plagiarism according to the copyright law, i.e. the scope of unjustified use of elements from elsewhere raises doubt (*examples required*).

The article does not bear any signs of plagiarism according to the copyright law.

3. FINAL EVALUATION OF THE ARTICLE *(strike where inapplicable)*

Accepted for publication in the *Studia Historiae Scientiarum*:

- no alterations suggested
- small changes suggested (no second peer review), requires:
 - editing
 - cutting
 - expanding
 - completing missing references
 - other changes

Significant corrections suggested (see below) and a second peer review required:

- editing
- cutting
- expanding
- completing missing references
- other changes.

Rejected from publication in the *Studia Historiae Scientiarum*.

4. COMMENTS AND SUGGESTED AMENDMENTS

Detailed comments (*Required if the answer to the questions was different than 'YES' in part 1, 'does not bear any signs of plagiarism' in part 2, and 'no alterations suggested' in part 3. The comments can be continued on the following pages*):

.....
.....
.....
.....

Suggested amendments before the publication of the article:

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....