



REVIEWER EVALUATION FORM

Manuscripts submitted to the Journal must be clear, original, concise, complete, with precise logic, and honestly appraised. The manuscript should be strongly related to the issues concerning EU Agrarian Law. Manuscripts consisting of an international comparison of countryside problems are invited.

Title:

Key words:

MANUSCRIPT PROFILE

Please indicate **X** in the boxes which, in your opinion, best describe the following features of the manuscript.

	Poor*	Marginal*	Acceptable	Good	Honours*
Originality of the work					
Scholarly relevance					
Professional/industrial relevance					
Completeness of the work					
Acknowledgement of the work of others by references					
Organization of the manuscript					
Clarity in writing, tables, graphs, and illustrations					
Likelihood of passing the 'test of time.'					
International aspects, comparativeness of the paper					

	YES	NO
In your opinion, is the research methodology and treatment of the subject in the paper plausible and free of technical errors?		
Are you aware of prior publication or presentation of this work?		
Is the manuscript free of commercialism?		
Is the paper too long?		
Does the paper include an abstract?		
Does the paper include keywords?		
Does the paper include a note on the author's affiliation?		



RECOMMENDATION: This manuscript is... (check only one box)

Honours quality	
Acceptable	
Acceptable with minor revisions	
Acceptable with major revisions (Please indicate whether you would like to see the revised manuscript.)	
Not acceptable	

Is it recommended for further review process? YES NO

If recommended for publication, please give a priority rating between 1 (lowest) and 5 (highest):

CONFIDENTIAL COMMENTS TO THE EDITORS

COMMENTS FOR TRANSMISSION TO THE AUTHOR(S)

Please include an initial paragraph that summarizes the major findings, your overall impressions, as well as highlighting major shortcomings of the manuscript.

To assist the author(s) in revising his/her/their manuscript, please separate your remarks into two sections:

(1) Suggestions that would improve the quality of the paper but are not essential for publication.

(2) Changes which must be made before publication

Reviewer's signature