

Reviewer's template

Please rate each item from **1 = lowest or worst** to **5 = highest or best**:

	No		Partly		Yes
Does the paper match the profile of the journal?	1	2	3	4	5
Does the paper demonstrate an adequate understanding of the relevant literature in the field and cite an appropriate range of literature sources?	1	2	3	4	5
Is the structure of the paper adequate? Is the paper well-organized with logical flow of argument?	1	2	3	4	5
Are the methods and results presented clearly and appropriately?	1	2	3	4	5
Do the conclusions adequately tie together the other elements of the paper?	1	2	3	4	5
Are the title and summary informative and relevant?	1	2	3	4	5
Does the paper contain new and significant information adequate to justify publication?	1	2	3	4	5
Does the text require language editing (proofreading)?	YES	NO			
Could the text be shortened with advantage? If yes please indicate the parts to be shortened (in suggestions for authors).	YES	NO			

What are the major strengths (qualities) of the paper?

What are the main weaknesses of the paper?

Suggestions to authors (corrections, amendments, changes, ...):

Your recommendation (please mark):

1. Accept without modifications
2. Accept after specified revisions
3. Revise and Resubmit
4. Reject with encouragement to submit to another journal
5. Reject

The paper should be published as:

1. Research paper
2. Case study