



Guidelines for reviewers

REVIEWER INSTRUCTIONS

Title of the article	
Reviewer	
Scientific title	
Institution, city, state	
Scientist's register number	
Date when you received the article for review	
Date when you submitted the review	
Please state, whether or not a conflict of interest exists for you to review this manuscript	
Date of manuscript submission	
Peer review deadline	

Note: Please give concise and reasoned scientific-methodological remarks in the table below. Confidential comments for the editor can be written at the end of the form. The review is anonymous for the authors. You can send it by e-mail.

REVIEWER EVALUATION FORM

Questions for reviewers	Yes/No	Note
Is the topic scientifically relevant considering the journal profile?		
Is the topic scientifically relevant and useful?		
Is the title clear and concise?		
The article's title reflects the content and purpose of the article		
The abstract is concise and relevant (up to 170-250 words / 1600 characters with spaces)		
The key words provide adequate index entry for the article (up to 5 words)		
Does the introduction contain clearly stated research objectives?		
Are the scientific arguments logical and persuasive?		
Are the empirical research results methodologically correctly presented? Give possible suggestions in case you think some amendments and refinements are needed.		
Are the methods appropriate and precisely documented?		
Are the statistic calculations precisely documented?		
Is the discussion clear and concise, without repetition and reasoned / supported by the data?		
Are the conclusions clear and concise?		
Do the conclusions illustrate the research results, findings and recommendations showing what is new and giving suggestions for future research?		
Does the extensive overview of the issue provide evidence and counterevidence of the author's own findings and research results?		
Should some parts of the article be shortened, deleted, extended or refined?		
Would you recommend some refinements in terms of style or language?		

Are the references used up-to date and is the format of the citations in Harvard style?		
Is the article in compliance with the author guidelines, i.e. are the abstract, keywords, literature, references and table and figure marks written upon the guidelines (given at http://www.mnje.com/en/author-guidelines)?		
Recommendation for the editor (circle one)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. to be published without changes 2. to be published after minor changes 3. to be published after significant changes 4. to be rejected 	
Reviewer's additional opinions, remarks and recommendations:		
Comments for the Author(s):		
Comments for the Editor:		
Date:		

Reviewer's signature
