Appendix to the *Review procedure of scientific articles submitted for publication in the Journal of Insurance, Financial Markets and Consumer Protection*

Article evaluation form

Article title: …………………………………………………………………………………..

(Reviewer chooses one possible answer to express his opinion (if applicable). Negative assessment requires justification.)

1. Title
- appropriate phrasing
- recommended to be changed to: …………………………………………..…………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………….

2. Scope
- stated clearly and correctly
- requires clarifications; suggestions, if available:…………………………………………….
………………………………………………………………………………………..…………

3. General assessment of source
- appropriate
- inappropriate (justification)……………………………………………………..…………..

4. Choice of primary sources
- none
- appropriate
- important bibliography is missing…………………………………………………………….…
………………………………………………………………………………………..…………
- inappropriate (justification)…………………………………………………………………..

5. Scientific methods
- new
- valuable modifications
- appropriate
- inappropriate (justification)…………………………………..………………………………

6. Statistical analysis[*]
- appropriate- N/A
- requires and update in accordance with reviewer's suggestions
- erroneous (justification)…………………………………………………………………..
[*] *Statistical analysis will be evaluated by a statistics editor*

7. Visual content (tables, charts, graphs)
- appropriate - N/A
- inappropriate (justification)
table, chart, graph number …. change in accordance with reviewer's remarks:………..……….
………………………………………………………………………………………………..

8. Interpretation of research findings
- appropriate
- requires and update in accordance with reviewer's suggestions ……………………………...
…………………………………………………………………………………………..………
………………………………………………………………………………………………...……

9. Abstract
- none available
- appropriate
- requires and update in accordance with reviewer's suggestions ……………………………...…
……………………………………………………………………………………………...……

10. Evaluation of linguistic, editorial and formal qualities [**]
- good
- requires minor changes (suggestions and remarks to be found in the text)
- required major rewriting (justification)………………………………………………………......
………………………………………………………………………………………………...

11. Evaluation with regard to factual content
- brings new added value
- valuable contribution
- valuable reconfirmation of existing views
- brings no new added value (justification)

12. Reviewer's additional remarks
……………………………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………………

13. Conclusions
- accepted for publication
- requires an update in accordance with reviewer's suggestions (without resending the article to the reviewer)
- resend for further evaluation after applying changes
- inappropriate for publication (justification) …………………………………………………..

………………………………………………..
Academic title, academic degree, name and surname, reviewer's signature

*** The article will be further evaluated by a language editor.*