

Acta Universitatis Sapientiae  
Film & Media Studies

<http://www.acta.sapientia.ro/acta-film/>

**Peer-Review Evaluation Form**

Title of the article submitted for evaluation:

Please signal all responses with **bold** letters and underline.

Is the work relevant to the research in the area of film and media studies?

Yes.

No.

Does the subject of the article have academic relevance?

Much relevance.

Some relevance.

No relevance at all.

Is the problem or objective clearly described?

Yes, it is well explained.

No, although you can deduct it.

It is not clear enough and should be explained more.

The objective of the article is unclear or not formulated.

The literature used is...

adequate and up-to-date.

acceptable, although could be improved.

insufficient and/or outdated.

<p>The theoretical discussion/analysis is ...</p> <p>dense, qualified and well argued.</p> <p>acceptable, but limited.</p> <p>weak and insufficient.</p>
<p>Is the methodology explicit and consistent?</p> <p>It is explicit and consistently carried through.</p> <p>It is explicit, but not consistent.</p> <p>It is not explicit and there is no consistency.</p>
<p>Is the text fluent, correct, and clear?</p> <p>Yes, fully.</p> <p>Yes, partially. Corrections needed.</p> <p>No.</p>
<p>Does the text meet the formal requirements of academic language?</p> <p>Yes, fully.</p> <p>Yes, partially.</p> <p>No.</p>
<p>Is the title appropriate to the subject?</p> <p>Yes, fully.</p> <p>Yes, partially. Needs to be rephrased.</p> <p>No.</p>
<p>Is the abstract adequate (describes the purpose, indicates theoretical framework, methods used, main results and conclusions)?</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>Yes, partially.</p> <p>No.</p>
<p>Should the article be published?</p> <p>Yes, without any changes.</p> <p>Yes, with minor changes.</p> <p>Only after major changes.</p> <p>No.</p>

General Comments about the article, recommendations for the author:

Details in case the article needs reworking: