REVIEW OF A PAPER

The title of the paper:

The surname of the author:

The number of the paper:

The surname of the reviewer:

A. Summary evaluation of the paper:

[] it can be accepted in its present form;

It can be accepted providing that the modifications recommended by the referees will be made,

[] such modifications that after making them the paper ought to undergo an additional review;

[] such modifications that after making them the paper do not have to undergo an additional review;

It cannot be accepted by “Physical Culture and Sport. Studies and Research” as a journal which publishes only papers from the area of social sciences of sport, because:

[] the paper does not meet scientific requirements in a sufficient way;

[] the subject matter of the paper is beyond the field of social sciences of sport.

B. The flaws of the paper:

1. [] It is not clear enough;

2. [] the opinions presented in it are not satisfactorily justified;

3. [] it takes into consideration the reference books important for the subject to a small degree;

4. [] It does not contribute to the presented field of study with any new information;

5. [] it takes advantage of other authors’ papers in a way which is not quite permissible;

6. [] it is too long or it contains redundant references;

7. [] it is stylistically incorrect in some places;

8. [] it has not been neatly worked out from the typographic point of view;

9. [] its title does not reflect its contents in a sufficient way;

10. [] its summary is not informative enough.

C. The justification and possible replenishment of the above-mentioned objections:

---

1 It will be given to the editorial board only and it will not be given to the author.
2 We ask that you choose one of the given marks putting an “x” in the proper square brackets.
D. Recommended modifications:

E. Detailed gradual evaluations:

On a point scale from 0 to 3 the reviewed paper deserves:

1. to get the following grade from the point of view of clarity and valid argumentations
2. to get the following grade from the point of view of the reliability of erudition (i.e. the degree of taking into account important reference books)
3. to get the following grade from the point of view of originality of its content
4. to get the following grade from the point of view of stylistic correctness and elegance

F. Possible replenishment and justification for these gradual evaluations

---

3 The opinions presented in E and F part are designed for the editorial board knowledge only. We kindly ask to give them only in these cases when the reviewer generally accepts them.