

REVIEW FORM

Title of the article:

.....

.....

Manuscript signature number:

Academic title, Name of the reviewer:

.....

.....

Academic affiliation:

.....

I. Evaluation of the article - part 1.

<i>Dear Reviewer, Please tick YES or NO Leave blank if not applicable.</i>		Evaluation	
		YES	NO
1.	Is the title adequate to the content of the article?		
2.	Does the introduction present the subject matter clearly enough ?		
3.	Does the article contain a summary of research methods ?		
4.	Is the bibliography used in the article adequate?		
5.	Is the subject matter of the article innovative? Does it shed more light on the matter it examines?		
6.	Does the article contain findings and a clear conclusion?		
7.	Do the findings and conclusion summarise conducted research and aims of the article well?		
8.	Are the figures embedded in the text selected with care and help illustrate the subject matter successfully?		

9.	Are the tables, charts or diagrams used by the author readable and designed with care?		
10.	Does the article's abstract present its content adequately?		
11.	Do the keywords match the subject matter of the article?		
Notes and comments			

II. Evaluation of the article - part 2.

<i>Dear Reviewer, please tick where appropriate.</i>		Answers				
		1 Insufficient	2	3	4	5 Outstanding
1.	To what degree is the subject matter or the article important in scientific terms?					
2.	What is the academic level of the article in light of available sources?					
3.	Is the article readable, consistent and logical?					
4.	Is the usage of terminology correct?					

Notes and comments

III. Final assessment of the article

Dear Reviewer, please mark your decision with a tick.

The article is suitable for publication:			
In its current form	After correction, in line with the reviewer's feedback	After a thorough re-editing and revision	The article is not suitable for publication

**Justification of the reviewer's decision
(this field cannot be left blank)**

.....
Place

.....
Date

.....
Signature of the reviewer
(not electronic)

Reviewer's personal data will be known only to the Editorial Board of ICAR – International Journal of Young Conservators and Restorers of Works of Art, according to the protocol of the ***double – blind reviewing process***.



**Reviewer’s declaration
of impartiality and lack of conflict of interests**

Name of the reviewer:

.....

Title of the article:

.....

.....

.....

Manuscript signature number:

.....

Reviews in ICAR – International Journal of Young Conservators and Restorers of Works of Art are conducted according to the double blind reviewing process protocol, which means that reviewers and authors do not know each other’s identities.

The reviewer should not undertake reviewing of the article if he or she knows the identity of the author or if there occurs a conflict of interests such as:

- *Direct personal relations, meaning kinship, privities, conflicts;*
- *Professional relations;*
- *Direct academic cooperation during the last two years prior to conducting the review.*

Please mark with a tick the true statement.

Hereby, I declare that:

I do not know identity of the author whose article is the subject of the review and there does not occur a conflict of interests

I know the identity of the author and/or there occurs a conflict of interests

In the case where reviewer knows the identity of the author and/or there occurs conflict of interests, the reviewer is asked not to conduct the review, leave the form blank and to send back the signed Declaration.

.....
Place

.....
Date

.....
Signature of the reviewer (not
electronic)

