

THE REVIEW OF EUROPEAN AND COMPARATIVE LAW

Peer review form

* *Reviewers required to complete item*

PART I. GENERAL EVALUATION*

Title of the Article	
Name of the reviewer	
Date of the peer review	

Is the manuscript consistent with the profile of the *Review of European and Comparative Law*? (describe below)*

A. RECOMMENDATION

Is the manuscript acceptable for the publication in the Review of European and Comparative Law? *

_____ Acceptable in present form

_____ Acceptable with minor revision, no further review necessary

_____ Major revision and a second review is required

_____ Not acceptable (provide detailed explanation under "comments" below)

B. EVALUATION

- 1) Is the title satisfactory? Explain. *
 - 2) How would you judge novelty of the manuscript?*
 - 3) How would you evaluate scientific importance of the manuscript for a comparative research?*
 - 4) Are sufficient references provided? Are they appropriate and free from obvious omissions? If not, explain.
If sources indexed in Scopus and/or Web of Science databases are indicated among the bibliographic items, specify them.*
 - 5) Does the manuscript present material effectively? *
- Could the clarity or efficiency be improved by changes in the order of the paper? _____
 - Should the language or grammar be improved? _____
 - Are there portions of the text that could be omitted? _____

- 6) Are there errors in factual information, applicable law, logic, analysis? _____ *
- Address these issues in detail in the "comments" (below). Suggest improvements.*

PART II. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS FOR THE AUTHOR (attach additional pages as necessary)

PART III. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS FOR THE EDITORIAL BOARD
Comments for the Editorial Team review only