Checklist for evaluating articles
submitted for publication in Zertte

Title of article:

Code:

Date of review:

Reviewer's name:

1. Type of article (tick one box)

- ☐ Research-based
- ☐ Reflective review
- ☐ Methodological
- ☐ Reflection on lesson
- ☐ Secondary research
- ☐ Experiential or project-based learning with results
- ☐ Student projects/experiments
- ☐ Master's or Doctoral study
- ☐ Interview
- ☐

2. How relevant is the article to the theme of the journal?

Fully.

In part.

Is not relevant. Please comment.

3. How well does the title reflect the content of the article?

Fully.

In part.

It does not reflect the content. Please comment.

4. The literature review:

Is present and fully sets out the theoretical background to the subject of the article.

Is present but is not developed with clarity or does not develop a particular point of view or argument.

Is present and of a very poor standard or is not present at all.

Other. Please comment.

5. The Methodology section:

    Is presented clearly.
    Is rather general in approach and does not give a full picture of the process.
    Is missing.
    Other. Please comment.

6. The Results and Conclusions section:

    Is original in its ideas and presents conclusions of interest to the academic community.
    Contains a few original ideas of interest to the academic community.
    Contains no original ideas.
    Other. Please comment.

8. The Reference section:

    Is present and corresponds to the requirements of the journal.
    Is present but there are some mistakes/omissions in formatting.
    Is absent or the references do not exist.
    Other. Please comment.

9. The language and style of the article:

- [ ] Is clear and appropriate in tone.
- [ ] Is mostly clear and appropriate in tone.
    Is in some places unclear and inappropriate in tone, requiring significant improvements.
    Please comment.

10. Recommendations:

    The article may be accepted for publication with no further changes.
    The article may be accepted but editing is required. Please comment.
    The article should not be accepted.

Overall comments and recommendations:
(This section is for any further comments on each of the evaluation criteria, as well
as any recommendations on how the article may be improved).
Oher. Please comment.