



Studia Universitatis Babeş-Bolyai

THEOLOGIA GRAECO-CATHOLICA VARADIENSIS

PEER REVIEW FORM

<i>Title of the paper</i>	
---------------------------	--

Please score each criterion on a scale of 1 to 5: 1= not at all (strongly disagree ... 5 = absolutely (strongly agree)	1	2	3	4	5
1. Title - the title is clear, concise and accurately reflects the content of the paper					
2. Abstract and keywords – the abstract clearly presents the aims, main argument and conclusions of the article; the keywords are relevant and appropriate					
3. Purpose and methodology – the purpose of the paper is clearly stated; an appropriate method/approach is used; the methodology and arguments are sound and logically developed					
4. Relevance to the field - the topic is appropriately addressed and relevant to the discipline; the author adequately explains the significance and contribution of the article to the field					
5. Structure and organisation – the structure is clear and logical; the aims are effectively introduced and contextualised; the conclusions are pertinent and clearly summarise the results and their implications					
6. Coherence and rigour – the argument is consistently developed and rigorously treated; the paper provides a solid overview of relevant previous studies in the field					
7. Style and originality – the paper makes an original scientific contribution; it offers an independent perspective and presents original analysis and interpretation					
8. Literature/Bibliography – the bibliography is recent, well-selected and appropriate to the topic; the sources and databases used are reliable; all information is accurate					
9. Quotations and referencing – references are correct, consistent and fairly evaluated; there is clear correspondence between in-text citations and the bibliography at the end of the paper					
10. Language and style – the vocabulary is academic and precise; the text contains no inconsistencies, grammatical errors or unclear phrasing; the language is clear, correct and fluent					
Sum of scores					
GENERAL SCORE (optional overall impression)					

Strong points of the paper:

Weak points of the paper:

Recommendations for revision:

Conclusions (please select one):

Accepted for publication without revision	
Accepted for publication with minor revisions	
Accepted for publication with major revisions	
Not suitable for publication (rejected)	

Date of review

Reviewer (name, institution, signature)