

I. Referee (Referee's data are NOT shared with the author of the article)

First name and last name:

affiliation:

II. Reviewed article – title

.....

III. Opinion

Does the article correspond to the <i>Thomistic Yearbook</i> profile?	
Is the title of the article adequate to its content?	
Are the interpretations / conclusions properly justified?	
Does the article provide something new?	
Is the structure of the article (or division into 'paragraphs') satisfactory?	
Is the language side (style etc.) satisfactory?	
Is keyword selection right? or other keyword suggestions:	
I assess the scientific value of the article as:	High Average Low

I believe that the article submitted for evaluation:

- can be published without changes
- can be published after minor changes
- can be published after major changes
- should be rejected

Please provide the justification for the opinion on the next page.

In the case of suggestions of significant changes or rejection, the Reviewer's comments may be anonymously forwarded to the author.

IV. Justification

V. Additional Notes

.....
Referee's signature