1. Reviewer (*The reviewer's data is NOT shared with the author of the article*)

Name: **…**

Institution: **…**

2. Reviewed article – title

**…**

3. Evaluation

*(choose from:* definitely yes / rather yes / rather no / definitely no*)*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| * Does the article deal with philosophical issues? |  | | |
| * Is the title of the article appropriate to its content? |  | | |
| * Are the interpretations/conclusions adequately justified? |  | | |
| * Does the article bring anything new to the issues discussed? |  | | |
| * Is the article’s composition (structure) satisfactory? |  | | |
| * Is the language side (style, etc.) satisfactory? |  | | |
| * Is the choice of keywords appropriate? |  | | |
| *(mark one)* | | | |
| * I estimate the scholar value of the article as: | high | mediate | low |

Conclusion – I think that the article submitted for evaluation *(mark one)*:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | can be published without changes |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | can be published with minor changes |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | can be published after significant changes |

|  |  |
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|  |  |
| --- | --- |
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