

Anonymous Peer Review Process

Guidelines for reviewers of papers for the Proceedings
of the International Scientific Conference for PhD students

“Začínající učitel v měnící se společnosti”

(Faculty of Education, Palacký University in Olomouc, 7 to 8 November 2017)

The title of an assessed text: ...

*(Unless otherwise instructed, mark each criterion on a scale 1 to 4 (1 – definitely yes, 2 – probably yes, 3 – probably no 4 – definitely no. Mark your choice with a **cross in a relevant column**. In case of a negative answer (3, 4) give reasons for the answer.*

1. The theme of the paper.

<i>significance</i>	<i>criterion</i>	<i>yes</i>	<i>no</i>
–	The paper belongs thematically to the area of pedagogic (educational) science		

Note. This is a criterion of exclusion. If the paper does not meet this criterion, there is no need to continue the review

2. Scientific significance of the text.

<i>significance</i>	<i>criterion</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>
2	Topic of the paper is up to date.				
1	The paper can be considered scientifically beneficial for educational science.				

In case of a negative answer, give reasons for it: ...

3. Composition of the paper.

<i>significance</i>	<i>criterion</i>	1	2	3	4
2	The composition of the paper is clear and well arranged (the content is arranged logically).				
1	The topic fits the content.				
1	The abstract fits the content.				
1	Key words are chosen properly according to the content.				

In case of a negative answer, give reasons for it:

4. Scientific value of the paper.

<i>significance</i>	<i>criterion</i>	1	2	3	4
4	The text is original. It presents original outcomes (theoretical analysis and/or research).				
4	The aim of the paper is appropriate for an expert scientific paper.				
3	The paper theoretically and methodologically belongs to the current scientific discourse.				
4	The paper reflects current state of scientific knowledge of the area.				
3	Methodology is described completely and clearly.				
4	The methods of scientific work used in the contribution are chosen appropriately.				
4	The methods of scientific work used in the contribution are applied correctly.				
4	Findings are adequately documented.				
2	The language of the text is expert and it uses expert terminology appropriately.				

In case of a negative answer, give reasons for it:

5. The quality of the language and the formal level of the paper.

<i>significance</i>	<i>criterion</i>	1	2	3	4
2	The text is grammatically and stylistically correct.				

1	The text (including abstract) is clear and comprehensible.				
1	Graphic level of the paper (graphic arrangement, clarity of the tables, graphs etc.) meets the corresponding level.				

In case of a negative answer, give reasons for it:

6. The use of sources.

<i>significance</i>	<i>criterion</i>	1	2	3	4
3	The author uses up to date, relevant and good quality sources.				
1	The author uses up to date external (other than Czech) sources.				
3	The author uses sources properly (copied parts of texts are correctly cited).				
2	Bibliography is complete (all of the sources cited in the text are included in bibliography).				

In case of a negative answer, give reasons for it:

7. Other criteria.

To complete this part of a review is voluntary. However, if you do it, you will spare editors lot of hard work. Thank you.

<i>significance</i>	<i>criterion</i>	yes	no
–	The title, abstract and key words are written in both languages (original language of the text and English).		
–	The length of text meets the limit (13.000 – 18.000 characters, including space character).		
–	Abstract and key words meet the limit (in Czech/Slovak and English together maximum 1.500 characters, including space character).		
–	The reference to sources and bibliography fully respect the APA citation norm.		
–	All bibliographic citations are written in Latin alphabet.		

8. Further comments, recommendations and notes for the author of the paper:

...

Final assessment (*underline or highlight according to your choice the final recommendation*):

- Recommend this paper for publishing
- Recommend this paper for publishing after minor changes (without further assessment of the reviewer)
- Recommend this paper for repeated assessment of a reviewer after the serious imperfections are revised
- The paper is not recommended for publishing

Date of completing this review: ...