"Neofilolog" - a Journal published by the Polish Association of Modern Languages (P	olskie
Towarzystwo Neofilologiczne)	

The second stage of evaluation: external peer-review	The second stage of	evaluation: external	peer-review
--	---------------------	----------------------	-------------

REFEREEING TEMPLATE FOR PAPERS SUBMITTED TO NEOFILOLOG (EXTERNAL PEER-REVIEW)

Arti	cle number							
Artio	cle Title							
	ewer's name and lame							
	date of receiving the er for a review							
The revi	date of sending a ew							
Article form: ☐ research review ☐ research report ☐ other								
I. ITEMS TO BE EVALUATED (CRITERIA GRID) (Mark one of the options with "X")								
L.P.	CRITERIA GRID	Yes	No	With reservations				
Title and abstract evaluation								
1.	Does the title reflect the content of the article?							
2.	Does the abstract and keywords reflect the content of the article?							
3.	Is the aim of the article described in the abstract/introduction?							
Structure, language and editing style evaluation								
4.	Are the aims announced in the introduction satisfactorily met?							
5.	Does the article have a clearly defined research aim, well described research methodology and major hypotheses as well as conclusions?							
6.	Is the content of the article's structured coherently and forms a comprehensive unity?							
7.	Is the article written in an academic register and discourse?							
8.	Has the article been edited according to the guidelinese provided for the authors on the Journal website?							
9.	Are the illustrations (tables, pictures, graphs etc.) legible, do they have titles and reference source?							
10.	Are the illustration included in the article (tables, pictures, graphs) adequately explained in the text?							
11.	Does the article end with a summary?							

L.P.	CRITERIA GRID	Yes	No	With reservations		
	Content Evaluation					
12.	Is the content of the article proper and to date with the contemporary knowledge?					
13.	Does the article make any development of a scientific nature?					
14.	Is the problem presented in the paper contextualized and argued well enough?					
15.	Does the article promote a new approach to the problem?					
16.	Is the description of research methodology, if present in the text, correct and exhaustive?					
17.	Does the content carry a didactic value?					
	Evaluation of quoting and reference sty	le				
18.	Is the article an original scientific paper (does not constitute a compilation of previous, well-known studies)?					
19.	Is the article supported by the latest scientific literature of the subject?					
20.	Is the quoted literature properly chosen and sufficient?					
21.	Is quoting style precise and in accordance with the Journal guidelines?					
l gra	II. FINAL EVALUATION OF THE ARTICLE de the article as follows (Mark one of the options with "X"):					
	1 – it should be published;					
☐ 3 — it should be rewritten and resubmitted;						
☐ 4 − it should be rejected.						
III. SPECIFIC COMMENTS Please specify in the case when you select "with reservations" to any of the categories of assessment in the first part (according to the example: Re: 1.; Re: 2.; Re: 3.; etc.)						