

THE REVIEW OF COMPARATIVE LAW**Peer review form****PART I. GENERAL EVALUATION**

Title of the Article	
Name of the reviewer	
Date of the peer review	

A. RECOMMENDATION

Is the manuscript acceptable for the publication in the Review of Comparative Law?

- _____ Acceptable in present form
- _____ Acceptable with minor revision, no further review necessary
- _____ Major revision and a second review is required
- _____ Not acceptable (provide detailed explanation under "comments" below)

B. EVALUATION

- 1) Is the title satisfactory? Explain.

- 2) How would you judge the novelty of the manuscript?

- 3) How would you evaluate the scientific importance of the manuscript for comparative research?

- 4) Are sufficient references provided? Are they appropriate and free from obvious omissions? If not, explain.

3) Does the manuscript present material effectively?

- Could the clarity or efficiency be improved by changes in the order of the paper? _____
- Should the language or grammar be improved? _____
- Are there portions of the text that could be omitted? _____

4) Are there errors in factual information, applicable law, logic, analysis? _____
Address these issues in detail in the "comments" (below). Suggest improvements.

PART II. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS FOR THE AUTHOR (attach additional pages as necessary)