

### Instructions to the reviewers

Thank you very much for agreeing to review this submission to *Studia Anglica Posnaniensia*. The editorial team highly appreciates the time and effort you have offered to improve the quality of the papers published in our journal.

Please complete all sections of the review form and return it to the assistant editor within 4-6 weeks of the receipt of the paper. All your comments about the quality of the paper should be entered into the relevant fields; do not annotate the paper itself, as it is not going to be returned to the author(s). If your general assessment is other than ACCEPT AS IS, please, provide detailed comments about the perceived imperfections of the paper. If you score below [3] on any point in the DETAILED ASSESSMENT section, we would also appreciate a comment about it in the COMMENTS FOR THE AUTHOR(S) field. If there are any points you do not want to share with the author(s), yet you would like to draw our attention to (these include, among others, identification of plagiarism in the paper, suggestions concerning reviewer choice and other editorial policies of *StAP*, and your refusal to review further papers by the same author(s) for us), please, enter them in the COMMENTS TO THE EDITOR section.

**Important:** According to our editorial practices, options available in the GENERAL ASSESSMENT section are interpreted as follows:

ACCEPT AS IS: The paper can be published in the current form, after formatting and language editing.

ACCEPT WITH MINOR REVISION: Minor corrections are necessary, however, they do not require the reviewer's acceptance.

ACCEPT WITH MAJOR REVISION: Major problems with the paper require substantial changes on the part of the author; you will be asked to assess their appropriateness on the basis of the revised version of the paper and authorial cover letter addressing your comments.

REVISE AND RESUBMIT: While the concepts addressed in the paper are worth pursuing, a major rewrite is necessary, usually after a re-design of the research procedure itself; if the paper is resubmitted, the review process will start anew, possibly with a different set of reviewers.

REJECT: The paper should not be published, and it is very unlikely that any amount of work on the part of the authors will ever change such a decision.

The Likert scale used in the DETAILED ASSESSMENT section should be interpreted as:

- [1] definitely not
- [2] mostly not
- [3] partially
- [4] mostly yes
- [5] definitely yes

PAPER TITLE

--

1. GENERAL ASSESSMENT (check one)

- Accept as is
- Accept with minor revisions
- Accept with major revisions
- Revise and resubmit
- Reject

2. DETAILED ASSESSMENT (for each point check one)

(a) general

1 2 3 4 5

- Does the paper match the *StAP* profile?
- Does the title reflect the content of the paper?
- Is the research presented in the paper original?
- Is the theoretical model adopted in the paper up-to-date?
- Is the secondary literature appropriate and complete?

(b) structure, form, and quality

1 2 3 4 5

- Is the research hypothesis/problem/purpose clearly stated?
- Are methods and data used in the research clearly presented?
- Are theoretical premises adequately presented?
- Is the presentation properly structured?
- Is the argument presented in a logical and clear fashion?
- Is the literature review carried out properly?
- Is the paper written in a clear and concise manner?
- Is the language of the paper of sufficient quality?
- Is the data analysis methodologically correct?
- Is the interpretation of results viable?
- Are the conclusions of the paper warranted by its content?

3. COMMENTS FOR THE AUTHOR(S)

--

4. COMMENTS FOR THE EDITOR (optionally)

--