

REVIEW OF MANUSCRIPT SUBMITTED
FOR PUBLICATION IN THE JOURNAL *MENO ISTORIJOS STUDIJS*

Title of the article:

Date of review:

1. Article introduction

1.1. Formulation of research problem and objective (if any): satisfactory / revisable / unsatisfactory

1.2. Substantiation of the problem and assessment of research already performed (if any): satisfactory / revisable / unsatisfactory

1.3. Methodological approach: satisfactory / unsatisfactory

1.4. Assessment of keywords: satisfactory / revisable / unsatisfactory

2. Assessment of the quality of the article's content (select the most appropriate)

2.1. Originality of the article: original / somewhat original / only slightly original

2.2. Relevance (importance) of the topic: high / average / low

2.3. Validity (soundness) of the use of sources and literature: sufficient / average / insufficient

2.4. The examples provided (tables, quotations, illustrations, etc.) are necessary, appropriate, informative: satisfactory / unsatisfactory

2.5. Validity (soundness) of the conclusions: sufficient / average / insufficient

2.6. Informativeness, accuracy and validity (soundness) of the abstract: sufficient / average / insufficient

2.7. Style of writing: good / average / poor

2.8. Compliance with formal requirements (footnotes, list of references, etc.): satisfactory / unsatisfactory

3. Substantive comments and suggestions (written in free form, additional pages to be used as needed)

4. Reviewer's conclusion on the suitability of the article for publication (mark the appropriate selection)

- 4.1. can be published
- 4.2. can be published after making minor corrections
- 4.3. can be published only after making substantial, fundamental changes
- 4.4. not to be published

Reviewer:

.....

(Educational title and academic degree. Name, surname and signature)

.....

(Main workplace, position)