

Comparative Legilinguistics
International Journal for Legal Communication

Review Details: (Title)

1. General value of the paper

- Innovative
- Valuable contribution
- Confirms existing knowledge
- Outside the scope of Comparative Legilinguistics

2. Title

- Accurately reflects content
- Needs revision (please suggest alternative)

3. Methods

- Adequate
- Inaccurately described
- Inadequate

4. Illustrative material

- Adequate number and quality
- Quality of illustration no. ... inadequate (comments at the end of the review)
- Completion necessary
- Unacceptable

5. Interpretation of results

- Correct
- May be accepted after corrections suggested by the Reviewer
- Incorrect

6. References

- Properly compiled
- Not in conformity with instructions
- Incomplete; important references missing

7. Abstract

- Satisfactory
- Satisfactory but too short
- Does not characterize the essence of the work
- Needs thorough revision

8. Language of the paper

- Good
- Must be improved

9. General opinion and suggestions concerning publication in Comparative Legilinguistics

- Very good – highly recommendable
- Good – recommendable if corrected according to suggestions
- Acceptable after drastic revision
- Poor – should not be published in Comparative Legilinguistics

10. Any additional comments to the editor or author should be given below. The review without any comments is not valid

Recommendation

(Set or adjust the reviewer recommendation.)

- Accept submission
- Revisions required
- Resubmit for review
- Resubmit elsewhere
- Decline submission
- See comments