

ANNALES UNIVERSITATIS APULENSIS. SERIES PHILOLOGICA
Manuscript Review Form

Title:

Date MS received:

Date review returned:

Name of Peer-Reviewer:

This Review Form should be completed and submitted electronically. Please complete both Part A and B of this manuscript Review Form before submitting it to the Associate Editor concerned.

Part A - Evaluation of criteria

Please indicate your evaluation of each of the nine criteria by placing an 'X' in the appropriate column. Please enter comments specific to particular criterion in the comments row below each criterion.

Criteria to be rated	Excellent	Acceptable	Unsatisfactory	N/A
1. Complete, clear and well-organized presentation				
Comments:				
2. Significance of research questions / research hypothesis				
Comments:				
3. Description of the problem within a theoretical framework (where appropriate)				
Comments:				
4. Literature review demonstrates a clear relationship to the problem				
Comments:				
5. Appropriateness of research design and methodology				
Comments:				
6. Accurate description of research findings				

Criteria to be rated	Excellent	Acceptable	Unsatisfactory	N/A
Comments:				
7. Sound argument, analysis and interpretation of data				
Comments:				
8. Logical conclusion and implications for education/linguistic theory, research and/or practice				
Comments:				
9. Appropriate referencing conventions are respected				
Comments:				

Part B - Recommendation

Based on my evaluation of the paper against the nine criteria in Part A, my recommendation for this paper is (indicate your recommendation with an 'X'):

- ___ **Accept**
(The paper is accepted as it is.)
- ___ **Accept with the following changes**
(The author(s) will be asked to revise the paper and resubmit, addressing reviewers' comments from Part A above and/or suggested changes below. The revised paper will not go through another round of review.)
- ___ **Resubmit after a major revision**
(A second round of review will be necessary.)
- ___ **Reject**
(The paper is not suitable for publication in the *ANNALES UNIVERSITATIS APULENSIS. SERIES PHILOLOGICA*)

Comments

INFORMATION ON THE PEER-REVIEWING PROCESS

Acceptance for publication is generally made following the presentation of the paper during one of the scientific national and/or international conferences organised by the Faculty of History and Philology. The papers will have been previously evaluated by the scientific committees of the conferences; the results of research will have been disseminated through public defence as part of the ensuing debates, so that the authors will have had the opportunity to make the necessary amendments.

Upon submission, all papers are re-evaluated by two members of the scientific committee of the journal, who are

peer reviewers; they generally follow some aspects that validate the scientific quality of the manuscripts: relevance and appropriateness of the research methods to the topic/field of study; the quality and significance of scientific literature review; appropriate referencing and citations; compliance with ethical issues; compliance with national and/or international academic writing and editing standards. Upon evaluation, each paper will be rated as follows:

- a). Accepted as it is;**
- b). Accepted with changes recommended by the reviewers;**
- c). Rejected.**