

Title of paper:

1. Character of the paper:

- | | | |
|-------------------------------|-----|--------------------------|
| a) original, problem exposing | 5 | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) synthetic and/or theoretic | 3–4 | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) field or laboratory report | 1–2 | <input type="checkbox"/> |

2. General opinion:

- | | | |
|--|---|--------------------------|
| a) work original and/or innovative | 3 | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) work contains some original/innovative elements | 1 | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) “second-hand” work, does not contain original/innovative elements | 0 | <input type="checkbox"/> |

3. Method(s)/Methodology:

- | | | |
|--|---|--------------------------|
| a) well chosen and appropriately applied | 2 | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) not precise enough | 1 | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) inaccurate | 0 | <input type="checkbox"/> |

4. Relation: Subject vs. Investigated Material:

- | | | |
|-------------------|---|--------------------------|
| a) adequate | 1 | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) not satisfying | 0 | <input type="checkbox"/> |

5. Interpretation of the material:

- | | | |
|--|---|--------------------------|
| a) convincing, persuasive | 3 | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) controversial, but can be accepted (cf. Reviewer’s suggestions) | 1 | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) needs important improvements | 0 | <input type="checkbox"/> |

6. Photographic material:

- | | | |
|--|---|--------------------------|
| a) right number and quality | 1 | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) poor quality, should be improved – nos: | 0 | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) inappropriate choice | 0 | <input type="checkbox"/> |

7. Drawings, Plans and Tables:

- | | | |
|--|---|--------------------------|
| a) well prepared and legible | 2 | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) poor quality, should be improved – nos: | 1 | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) inappropriate and/or insufficient | 0 | <input type="checkbox"/> |

8. Bibliography and Notes:

- | | | |
|---|---|--------------------------|
| a) well chosen and composed | 2 | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) defective composition | 1 | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) not complete, important titles missing | 0 | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) inappropriate choice | 0 | <input type="checkbox"/> |

9. Language and terminology:

a) appropriate and clear	2	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) needs some small improvements (cf. Reviewer's suggestions)	1	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) inappropriate	0	<input type="checkbox"/>

10. Overall/General opinion on prospects and use of publishing the work:

a) can be published in its present form	≥ 16	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) can be published after some minor improvements	13–15	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) can be published after complete rewriting*	10–12	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) should not be published*	< 10	<input type="checkbox"/>

* To be rejected in this form and returned to the Author.

DETAILED COMMENTARY:

I agree to transmit the above remarks to the Author
(The Reviewer's data will not be disclosed to the Author)

Date:

(Reviewer's signature)