

The review of the paper submitted to the journal

‘Archiwa Biblioteki i Muzea Kościelne’

Number of the paper:

Title of the paper:

Reviewer:

Reviewer's ORCID number:

Yes No

- | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Is the paper original? |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Does the title of the paper correspond with its content? |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Does the author formulate the research subject and the reasons for working on it in a proper way? |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Was the aim of the paper achieved? |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Are the findings presented in the paper new? |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Are the language and the style of the paper correct? |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Is the choice of the literature and sources sufficient and appropriate to the issues addressed in the paper? |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Are the conclusions appropriate and are they reflected in the content and findings of the paper? |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Is the abstract correctly edited? |

The quality of the included information:

a) outstanding

b) very good

c) good

d) medium

e) poor

f) no information

I suggest:

1. accepting the paper as: a/ an article

b/ a brief communication

- IN THE SUBMITTED FORM

- AFTER REVISION

2. rejecting the paper

.....

Place and date

.....

Signature

The substantive justification of the paper evaluation and descriptive comments

Place and date

Signature