

Památky archeologické

Peer review contribution no. (completed by editor).

Please send your peer review to pamatky@arup.cas.cz within one month. Thank you.

Peer reviewer and his/her **place of work**:

Date review completed:

Title of contribution:

Author(s) of the contribution:

Basic features of the evaluated contribution

- | | | |
|---|------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 1. Does the contribution represent original scientific work?..... | <input type="checkbox"/> yes | <input type="checkbox"/> no |
| 2. Is the structure of the work well-arranged and understandable?..... | <input type="checkbox"/> yes | <input type="checkbox"/> no |
| 3. Are all the presented assertions sufficiently well-argued?..... | <input type="checkbox"/> yes | <input type="checkbox"/> no |
| 4. Is the title of the contribution apposite? | <input type="checkbox"/> yes | <input type="checkbox"/> no |
| 5. Is the cited literature relevant and complete?..... | <input type="checkbox"/> yes | <input type="checkbox"/> no |
| 6. Is the language of the contribution at an appropriate level?..... | <input type="checkbox"/> yes | <input type="checkbox"/> no |
| 7. Are the illustrations of sufficient quality, appropriate and necessary?..... | <input type="checkbox"/> yes | <input type="checkbox"/> no |

8. Final evaluation of the article on a scale of 1–4 (see the explanations for further details):

1. **I recommend** for publication **without comment**
2. **I recommend** for publication **with reservations**
3. **I recommend** for publication **after rewriting**
4. **I do not recommend** for publication

1. with minor modifications

2. weightier comments in relation to the theme require further work, and modifications or completion of appended illustrations

3. an interesting and important theme has been drafted for publication in an unsuitable and inadequate manner

4. the theme – the direction of the contribution, its content and the formal drafting, or its scope, provide no possibility of being suitable for publication even after extensive reworking

Rationale for your evaluation

The greatest benefits/**deficiencies** of the work and **especially an enumeration of the required modifications and amendments** in accordance with points 8.1–8.3

(preferably in **bullet points**; please **continue on a new page**):