



SEeB REVIEW FORM

Code of the paper:

Paper's title:

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR AUTHORS

(section will be shown to authors)

*The following questions do not substitute for specific comments made for authors.
Please give further details in the comments for the authors' section below.
(Put "x" in the right place).*

	Yes	Can be improved	Must be improved	No	Not applicable
Is the content succinctly described and contextualized with respect to the previous and present theoretical background and empirical research (if applicable) on the topic?					
Are the research design, questions, hypotheses, and methods clearly stated?					
Are the arguments and discussion of findings coherent, balanced and compelling?					
For empirical research, are the results clearly presented?					
Are the conclusions thoroughly supported by the results presented in the article or referenced in secondary literature?					

ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND STYLE

Mark only one of the following options.

Extensive editing of the English language and style required	
Moderate English changes required	
English language and style are fine/minor spell check required	
I don't feel qualified to judge the English language and style	

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR EDITORS

(section will not be shown to authors)

*If you answered "yes" to any of the following questions in the next table,
please give details in the comments for the editors' section below.*

	Yes	No
Do you have any potential conflict of interest with regard to this paper?		
Did you detect plagiarism?		
Did you detect inappropriate self-citations by authors?		
Do you have any other ethical concerns about this study?		

	Yes	No	With Reservations
Is the paper consistent with the <i>Studia Ecologiae et Bioethicae</i> profile?			

RATINGS

	High	Average	Low	No Answer
Originality				
Contribution to Scholarship				
Quality of Structure and Clarity				
Logical Coherence/Strength of Argument/ Academic Soundness				
Engagement with sources as well as recent scholarship				
Overall Merit				

PUBLISHING SUGGESTIONS

*Mark **only one** of the following options.*

The paper should be published without any substantial changes	
The paper should be published but minor revisions are required	
The paper could be published but needs substantial changes	
The paper should not be published	

COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS FOR AUTHORS

Reviewers may also write detailed comments in a separate sheet file, referring to the numbers of lines of the text in MS Word, or comment directly in the MS Word file, using track mode.

(section will be shown to authors)

COMMENTS FOR EDITORS

(section will not be shown to authors)

Reviewer's name and e-mail:

Reviewer's affiliation:

Date and signature: