

***Comparative Oriental Manuscript Studies Bulletin* Peer review evaluation form**

You are receiving this form because you have kindly agreed to review an article for the ***Comparative Oriental Manuscript Studies Bulletin***.

All the papers submitted for publishing must be written in compliance with the Bulletin's Guidelines for the authors and are subject to double-blinded review.

In reviewing please pay attention to the following elements:

- It is important to consider and conclude if the paper makes a valuable contribution to existing knowledge and literature in terms of theory development, new data, new methodology etc.
- Is the paper written and submitted according to Guidelines for the authors.
- Is the paper written and presented up to publishable standards of the *COMSt Bulletin* in terms of: whether any concepts have been defined adequately, whether the paper is well structured with coherent argumentation and well integrated, clarity of any data, tables and diagrams, whether the title reflects the contents of the paper accurately, if any part of the paper should be cut out, restructured or further developed.
- Appropriateness of referencing in terms of giving adequate credit to other contributors in the field, major omissions and whether the references are complete and written correctly.
- Reviewers proposal to the course of action may be to: accept the paper as presented, repeat the review process after changes recommended by reviewer, reject the paper.

Be assured that your identity will be kept strictly confidential. All comments shall be forwarded anonymously.

I. Reviewers personal data

NAME:			
TITLE:			
ORGANIZATION:			
ADDRESS:			
PHONE:		E-MAIL:	
<i>Hereby I state that submitted review is done objectively and is solely based on professional, scientific and ethical standards.</i>		SIGNATURE	

II. The Review

A. TITLE OF THE PAPER

B. RECOMMENDATION SUMMARY

**Accept with no
objections**

**Accept with minor
corrections**

**Accept after review in
accordance with the indications**

Reject

C. GENERAL EVALUATION OF THE PAPER

Excellent

Good

Average

Weak

1. Relevance of the contribution
2. Adequacy of methodology
3. Adequacy of bibliography
4. Originality of proposed results
5. Clarity of argument
6. Quality of style and language

Please provide remarks concerning points C1 to C6 (even if very briefly):

D. REVIEWERS COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR REVISION (if any)

The reviewers may use additional space or also resend the manuscript with integrated comments; these shall be anonymized before forwarding them to the authors.