

Double-Blind Peer Review Evaluation Form

Manuscript Title:

Reviewer Code:

Date of Review Completion:

Evaluation Criteria:

1. Relevance of Research Topic:

- Highly Relevant
- Relevant
- Moderately Relevant
- Irrelevant

Comments: _____

2. Quality of Writing:

- Excellent
- Good
- Satisfactory
- Poor

Comments: _____

3. Argumentation and Logical Reasoning:

- Excellent
- Good
- Satisfactory
- Poor

Comments: _____

4. Originality and Contribution:

- Highly Original and Contributive
- Original and Contributive
- Moderately Original and Contributive
- Lacking Originality and Contribution

Comments: _____

5. Bibliographic References:

- Comprehensive and Relevant
- Adequate
- Inadequate
- Missing

Comments: _____

6. Conclusion Foundation:

- Well-Founded
- Moderately Well-Founded
- Insufficiently Founded
- Unfounded

Comments: _____

7. Overall Recommendation:

- Accept
- Accept with Minor Revisions
- Accept with Major Revisions
- Reject

Comments: _____

Reviewers are required to submit this completed form along with their detailed review report. The aim is to ensure a transparent, unbiased, and constructive review process that upholds the highest standards of academic integrity and quality.

This structured procedure and evaluation form help maintain the integrity and quality of the publication process, ensuring that only high-standard, original, and well-researched articles are published in the Annals of the West University of Timișoara - Law Series.