# Review of paper submitted to “Krakowski Rocznik Archiwalny”

## Title:

## General opinion (please mark one of the following opinions):

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | The paper may be published in its current form. |  |
|  | The paper may be published after small changes/supplements. |  |
|  | The paper may be published after significant changes/supplements. |  |
|  | The paper is not suitable for publishing. |  |

## Evaluation of content yes no

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Does the text present the current state of knowledge? |  |  |
|  | Is the subject and/or its perspective innovative? |  |  |
|  | Are the research method, interpretation and conclusions correct?  (if the text is historical source editing, is the accepted publishing method suitable?) |  |  |
|  | Is the literature concerning the subject selected and used suitably? |  |  |
|  | Has the paper previously been published (to the knowledge of the Reviewer) in whole or partially somewhere else? |  |  |
|  | Is the subject in accordance with the profile of “Krakowski Rocznik Archiwalny”?  In which section should the paper be placed (please mark): papers, source materials, archival issues, miscellanea, reviews and discussions |  |  |

## Evaluation of form yes no

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Is the title clear and relevant to the content? |  |  |
|  | Does the text have a logical structure? |  |  |
|  | Is the text clear and correct in terms of language and style? |  |  |
|  | Could the text be shortened without any negative effects? If yes, in which parts? |  |  |
|  | Are the footnotes presented correctly? |  |  |

## General comments:

(Please write any detailed comments on a separate sheet or directly on the text of the paper)

## Reviewer (scientific title, full name, institution):

(date and signature of the Reviewer)