**Review form for studies and materials for the Czech-Slovak Historical Yearbook**

**(If you select an option marked with an asterisk (\*), further elaboration is required in the final verbal evaluation.)**

**Title of the text under review:**

**1) The text corresponds to the Czech-Slovak Historical Yearbook’s focus**

a) The text is suitable for publication in the CSHR as regards the choice of topic

b) The text is, with reservations, suitable for publication in the CSHR as regards the choice of topic\*

c) The text is not suitable for publication in the CSHR as regards the choice of topic\*

**2) The text is an original / a similar version has not been published yet**

a) Yes

b) No\*

**3) The text’s contribution to the field is**

a) Major

b) Positive with no additions recommended

c) Positive with additions recommended\*

d) Minor\*

**4) Suitability of the methodological procedures chosen in the text**

a) The chosen methodology corresponds to the nature of the topic

b) The chosen methodology suffers from some minor problems, but no revision of, or additions to, the text are required\*

c) The chosen methodology suffers from some minor problems; revision of, or additions to, the text are required\*

d) The chosen methodology does not correspond to what the topic requires\*

**5) Knowledge of relevant sources and literature**

a) Excellent

b) Good, additions suggested\*

c) Insufficient\*

**6)** **Language**

a) Excellent

b) Good, minor changes required

c) Average, changes required

d) Poor, substantial revision required

**7) Overall evaluation**

a) I recommend the text under review for publication without reservations

b) I recommend the text under review for publication once the minor comments listed in my review have been addressed\*

c) The text under review can be published after major modifications or substantial revision; new review required\*

d) I recommend the text under review for publication in another type of periodical (please specify the proposed journal)\*

e) I do not recommend the text under review for publication\*

**8) Final verbal evaluation**

(If you have selected an option marked\* in the individual sections, please focus on the relevant issues.)

Reviewer’s name:

Reviewer’s department:

Contact details:

Date: Signature:

**Reviewers’ Professional Code of Conduct:**

The reviewer must be objective.

Reviewers who do not feel qualified to review the manuscript or cannot review it within a reasonable time frame or due to a conflict of interest must notify the editorial board and will not be involved in the review procedure.

Reviewers must substantiate their views clearly.

Each manuscript is considered a confidential document and must not be disclosed to, or discussed with, anyone without the author’s consent.

Reviewers must maintain impartiality and must not misuse the information contained in the reviewed manuscript for personal or other purposes. Reviewers may refuse to review a manuscript on the grounds of a conflict of professional interest. A conflict of interest is defined as:

* Professional, financial, or personal benefit accruing to the reviewer from the approval or rejection of a peer-reviewed paper;
* Cooperation on the project in question.

Unless reviewers refuse to review manuscripts for some of the above reasons, the editors will assume that no conflict of interest exists.

Reviewers should draw the author’s attention to any omitted significant publications or existing archival and other sources on the topic. Reviewers should bring to the attention of the editors any significant similarity or overlap of the manuscript with other publications of which they are aware (see point 2).