

Evaluation Form

Concerning the selection of materials proposed for publication in the *Yearbook of „George Barițiu” Institute of History in Cluj-Napoca, series Historica, nr..... year.....*

Reviewer peer review 1:

Title of materials proposed for publication:

Author:

Scientific/teaching title/institutional affiliation:

1. The proposed study is according to the Yearbook's topic and profile

Yes (mark)	No (mark)	
Evaluation:		

2. The material contains the minimum in terms of conditions imposed by the Yearbook's editorial staff: text format, English abstract, keywords, data on the author's institutional affiliation, contact address (e-mail).

Yes (mark)	No (mark)	
Evaluation:		

3. Data concerning the extension of the proposed material: does it follow the Yearbook's topic and profile?

Yes (mark)	No (mark)	
Evaluation:		

4. Scientific quality of the presented material.

Yes (mark)	No (mark)	
Evaluation:		

5. Is a proper scientific methodology / according to the topic present in the proposed study?

Yes (mark)	No (mark)	
Evaluation:		

6. Is the content of the study reflected by its title?

Yes (mark)	No (mark)	
Evaluation:		

7. Is the study a thorough and comprehensive enough approach of the subject in terms of scientific criteria?

Yes (mark)	No (mark)	
Evaluation:		

8. The study reflects an appropriate level of documentation of the author on the topic, demonstrated by footnotes and an appropriate scientific language.

Yes (mark)	No (mark)	
Evaluation:		

9. The author complies with the rules of ethics and conduct in scientific research, demonstrated by relevant bibliographic references.

Yes (mark)	No (mark)	
Evaluation:		

10. Conclusions on the assessment of the material.

Yes (mark)	No (mark)	
Evaluation:		

11. Recommendations.

--