



WEB OF SCIENCE



# Article peer review evaluation form



Balneo Research Journal

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.12680/balneo.2018.16x>

Vol.9, No.1, February 2018

p: xx – xx

## Romanian Association of Balneology

Editor-in-chief: Constantin Munteanu

E-mail address: [office@bioclima.ro](mailto:office@bioclima.ro)

**This form must be used for peer review of articles submitted for publishing in Balneo Research Journal.**

1. Title of article:			
2. Evaluation of article:			
	no	partly	yes
<b>Does the title appropriately reflect the content of the article?</b>			
<b>Does the abstract appropriately reflect the content of the article?</b>			
<b>Are the key words suitably selected?</b>			
<b>Is the hypothesis clearly stated in the introduction and adequately discussed to the article?</b>			
<b>Does the content of the article correspond with the title and abstract?</b>			
<b>Are the conclusions clearly given in the final section?</b>			
<b>Is the list of references complete and does it match the citations in the article?</b>			
<b>Is the article presented according to IMRAD (Introduction, Methods, Results, Discussion)?</b>			
<b>Are the purpose and goals of the research clearly stated in the introduction?</b>			
<b>Is the theoretical background appropriately explained and based relevant references?</b>			
<b>Is the research methodology precisely and comprehensibly described?</b>			
<b>Are research findings clearly and comprehensibly presented?</b>			
<b>Is the discussion sufficiently broad and puts the results in the wider scientific context?</b>			
<b>Does the article have theoretical/analytical content (and it is not an empirical research)?</b>			
<b>Does the author(s) clearly express and explain their own professional viewpoints?</b>			
3. Final assessment:			
<b>The article is appropriate for publication without any improvements</b> <input type="checkbox"/>		<b>with minor improvements</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>The article is appropriate for publication after major improvements</b> <input type="checkbox"/>			
<b>The article is not appropriate for publication</b> <input type="checkbox"/>			
4. Classification in the COBISS bibliographical system:			
Please indicate the most appropriate COBISS code for the article (see enclosure):			
<input type="checkbox"/> <b>1.01 (original <i>scientific</i> article)</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>1.03 (short <i>scientific</i> article)</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Other:</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> <b>1.02 (review article/<i>scientific</i> review)</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>1.04 (professional article) – <i>non-scientific</i></b>		
5. The peer reviewer has enclosed remarks to the author for improving the article:			
	no		yes
6. Date of peer review:		7. Signature of peer reviewer:	

Peer reviewer's remarks (suggestions for changes, improvements, etc.):