RĪGAS STRADIŅA UNIVERSITĀTE

Form No. ZP-4

APPROVED
by Rīga Stradiņš University Rector's
Decree No 5-1/306/2019, dated 13.11.2019

REVIEW FORM

1. Information on the manuscript of the monograph

Authors	
Scientific Editor	
Title	
Field of science	
Sub-field of science	
Conformity assessment of the content of the manuscript for the specified field and sub-field of science	☐ Compliant ☐ Non-compliant. Please comment

2. Conformity of the manuscript with the criteria of a scientific/collective monograph

What scientific topic or problem is the manuscript devoted to?	
What results of fundamental or business research are reflected in the manuscript?	
Were the research results obtained using scientific methods recognised in the specific field of science? Please, name them.	
Does the manuscript contain elements of scientific novelty? Please, name them.	
Does the amount of work correspond to the generally accepted scope of a scientific/collective monograph?	
Is the introductory article of the manuscript unifying and analytical?	

3. Are you aware of monographs of similar contents?

☐ No.

☐ Yes. Please name the monographs and their authors.

4. Who do you think will benefit from this monograph?

5. Will this monograph also be used as a textbook? If so, within what course or programme? Does your institution of higher education offer such a course or programme?

6. Conformity of the manuscript with the requirements for the development of a scientific monograph – please tick the criteria fulfilled:

☐ The title corresponds to the content

☐ The manuscript is uniform in content and method

☐ Theoretical aspects and examples of scientific research are presented methodically correctly

☐ The structure of the manuscript is uniform and comprehensible (system of parts, chapters and sub-chapters, choice and layout of the body text and the supplementary text)

☐ The content of the chapters corresponds to the thought expressed in the headings

☐ The manuscript is systemic and systematic

☐ The use of terms is consistent and sequential, the terms are used correctly

☐ Illustrative material is obvious and understandable

☐ Principles for the use of scientific language have been adhered to

☐ The content of sentences is comprehensible, and the principle of proportionality is observed in their construction

☐ There is a clear and correct list of references and literature used

Please comment on the criteria that were not met:

7. Principles of research ethics have been observed in the development of the content of the manuscript – please tick the criteria fulfilled:

☐ The content of the manuscript is not very similar to any monograph already published that I know

☐ The content of the manuscript complies with generally accepted ethical and moral standards and does not contain incitement to violence or intolerance

☐ The views expressed by the authors are objective

Please comment on the criteria that were not met:

8. Reviewer's opinion on the compliance of the manuscript with the criteria of a scientific/collective monograph and the requirements for the development of a monograph – please tick as appropriate:

☐ Compliant – no need to improve the manuscript

☐ Partially compliant – the manuscript must be improved by editing it

☐ Non-compliant

Please provide the justification for your opinion and instructions for improving the manuscript:

In case of improvement and resubmission of the manuscript, I am ready to consider repeated reviewing and assessing of the work – please tick as appropriate:

☐ Yes

☐ No

Reviewer *[Name, Surname]*

Scientific institution

_____

(signature)

Date