UNIVERSITATEA DIN ORADEA
Facultatea
de Litere

"confluente"
Texts & Contexts Reloaded

Peer-Review Form

Reviewer's Name: (please fill in)

Title of the Paper: (please fill in)

Date: (please fill in)

1. GENERAL VALUE AND CONTRIBUTION

☐ Innovative contribution (offers new insights, approaches, or findings)

☐ Valuable addition to existing scholarship (solid and well-argued)

☐ Confirms/affirms existing knowledge (reliable but not original)

☐ Of questionable value (please justify below)

Comments: Does the paper advance the field? What is its key contribution?

2. TITLE AND SUBTITLES

☐ Clear, accurate, and reflective of the content

☐ Partly appropriate, some adjustments needed

☐ Inaccurate or misleading (please suggest alternatives below)

Comments:

3. ABSTRACT (INCLUDING TRANSLATION)

☐ Clear, concise, accurately summarizes the paper

☐ Too short

☐ Too long

☐ Does not reflect the essence of the paper

☐ Requires significant revision

Comments:

4. INTRODUCTION AND RESEARCH QUESTION

☐ Provides sufficient background and context

☐ Research question / aim is clearly stated and justified

☐ Introduction lacks clarity or is too general

Comments:

5. RESEARCH METHODS / APPROACH

☐ Clearly described and appropriate for the study's aim

☐ Partly appropriate / some weaknesses

☐ Inadequately described or unsuitable

Comments:

6. ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF RESULTS

☐ Clear, logical, and well supported by evidence

☐ Generally sound, but some parts need clarification

☐ Weak or confused interpretation

Comments:

7. ILLUSTRATIONS / FIGURES / TABLES (IF APPLICABLE)

☐ Adequate in number, relevance, and quality

☐ Partly adequate; some improvements needed

☐ Inadequate or unnecessary

Comments:

8. STYLE, STRUCTURE, AND CLARITY

☐ Well structured and clearly written

☐ Acceptable, but some reorganisation or language editing recommended

☐ Poorly structured / unclear

Comments:

9. REFERENCES AND CITATIONS

☐ Complete, appropriate, and in accordance with the journal's style

☐ Incomplete or inconsistent

☐ Important references missing

☐ Possible plagiarism suspected

Comments:

10. OVERALL RECOMMENDATION

☐ Accept without changes

☐ Accept with minor revisions

☐ Accept with major revisions

☐ Reject

Comments: Summary of key reasons for recommendation:

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS FOR THE EDITOR AND/OR AUTHOR

(Please provide specific suggestions for improvement, indicate strong and weak points, and note any ethical concerns if applicable.)

Reviewer's Signature (optional): (please fill in if appropriate)

Confidentiality Notice:

This review is confidential and intended solely for the editorial board of Confluente. Texts & Contexts Reloaded. It must not be shared or disclosed without the consent of the editors.