

**SCIENTIFIC JOURNAL
OF POLISH NAVAL ACADEMY**

ZESZYTY NAUKOWE AKADEMII MARYNARKI WOJENNEJ

.....date.....

Reviewer.....

title, scientific degree, first name and surname

.....

address

REVIEW ARTICLE

Title.....

.....

.....

	yes	no	undecided
1. Is the article title consistent with its content?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Is the title of the article topical?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Are the presented results new countrywide?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Are the presented methods new countrywide?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Do the presented results and methods open new perspectives or areas for research and application in the specific field?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Does the author clearly indicate what he/she has achieved?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Is the wording of the article appropriate?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. Is the selection and analysis of the literature used pertinent and sufficient?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. Is the language of the article appropriate?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10. Is the abstract written correctly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11. Is the terminology correct?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12. Are the illustrations appropriate and properly presented?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
13. Are the graphics level and readability of the illustrating materials appropriate?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

14. The quality of information included in the article is:

- very good
- good
- fair
- poor (issue obvious for specialists)

15. Expected interest in the article:

- wide
- narrow (for specialists)
- none

16. Purpose of publishing the article:

- publishing desirable
- publishing gratuitous

17. Is the article acceptable for publication?

- yes in the form and volume presented
- yes after editorial recommendations
- yes after subject-matter corrections
- yes after it is completely reworded
- yes in the future after the research is supplemented or extended
- no the article is not acceptable for publication

Article evaluation:

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

Detailed remarks shall be place on a separate sheet or marked in the text.

.....
Signature reviewer