

MAJOR REVIEW FORM¹

Title of the article:

.....

.....

Manuscript signature number:

Academic title, Name of the reviewer:

.....

.....

Academic affiliation:

.....

I. Evaluation of the article - part 1/3.

<i>Dear Reviewer, Please tick YES or NO Leave blank if not applicable.</i>		Evaluation	
		YES	NO
1.	Is the title adequate to the content of the article?		
2.	Does the introduction present the subject matter clearly enough ?		
3.	Does the article contain a summary of research methods ?		
4.	Does the division of the manuscript into sections make the text legible and ordered?		
5.	Are the titles of the sections adequate to their contents?		
6.	Is the bibliography used in the article adequate?		
7.	Is the subject matter of the article innovative? Does it shed more light on the matter it examines?		
8.	Does the article contain findings and a clear conclusion?		

¹ MAJOR REVIEW is the first stage of three-step reviewing process adopted in ICAR. The next steps are Minor review, which is less extensive and eventually the Final assessment.

9.	Do the findings and conclusion summarise conducted research and aims of the article well?		
10.	Are the figures embedded in the text selected with care and help illustrate the subject matter successfully?		
11.	Are the tables, charts or diagrams used by the author readable and designed with care?		
12.	Does the article's abstract present its content adequately?		
13.	Do the keywords match the subject matter of the article?		
<p>Notes and comments</p> <p>If there are any problems with the article regarding the issues mentioned in the questions 1-13 above, please elaborate it in this field (adding the number of the question may be helpful). The author is sent the results of the review (without personal data of the reviewer) therefore we will appreciate any additional comments and remarks concerning the above-mentioned aspects of the article, which may be educative for the author.</p> <p><expand this field if needed></p>			

II. Evaluation of the article - part 2/3.

<i>Dear Reviewer, please tick where appropriate.</i>		Answers				
		1 Insufficient	2	3	4	5 Outstanding
1.	To what degree is the subject matter or the article important in scientific terms?					
2.	What is the academic level of the article in light of available sources?					
3.	Is the article readable, consistent and logical?					
4.	Is the usage of terminology correct?					

Notes and comments

If there are any problems with the article regarding the issues mentioned in the questions 1-4 above, please elaborate it in this field (adding the number of the question may be helpful). The author is sent the results of the review (without personal data of the reviewer) therefore we will appreciate any additional comments and remarks concerning the above-mentioned aspects of the article, which may be educative for the author.

<expand this field if needed>

III. Remarks about respective sections of the article – part 3/3.

Dear Reviewer, please write down comments on each section of the article.

The author is sent the results of the review (without personal data of the reviewer) therefore we will appreciate any additional comments and remarks concerning the above-mentioned aspects of the article, which may be educative for the author.

<expand this field if needed>

IV. Final assessment of the article

Dear Reviewer, please mark your decision with a tick.

The article is suitable for publication:			
In its current form	After correction, in line with the reviewer's feedback	After a thorough re-editing and revision	The article is not suitable for publication
<p style="text-align: center;">Justification of the reviewer's decision (this field cannot be left blank)</p> <p>The author is sent the results of the review (without personal data of the reviewer) therefore we will appreciate comments and remarks concerning the above-mentioned aspects of the article, which may be educative for the author.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><expand this field if needed></p>			

.....
Place

.....
Date

.....
Signature of the reviewer
(not electronic)

Reviewer's personal data will be known only to the Editorial Board of ICAR – International Journal of Young Conservators and Restorers of Works of Art, according to the protocol of the ***double – blind reviewing process***.



**Reviewer’s declaration
of impartiality and lack of conflict of interests**

Name of the reviewer:

.....

Title of the article:

.....

.....

.....

Manuscript signature number:

.....

Reviews in ICAR – International Journal of Young Conservators and Restorers of Works of Art are conducted according to the double blind reviewing process protocol, which means that reviewers and authors do not know each other’s identities.

The reviewer should not undertake reviewing of the article if he or she knows the identity of the author or if there occurs a conflict of interests such as:

- *Direct personal relations, meaning kinship, privities, conflicts;*
- *Professional relations;*
- *Direct academic cooperation during the last two years prior to conducting the review.*

Please mark with a tick the true statement.

Hereby, I declare that:

I do not know identity of the author whose article is the subject of the review and there does not occur a conflict of interests

I know the identity of the author and/or there occurs a conflict of interests

In the case where reviewer knows the identity of the author and/or there occurs conflict of interests, the reviewer is asked not to conduct the review, leave the form blank and to send back the signed Declaration.

.....
Place

.....
Date

.....
Signature of the reviewer (not
electronic)