

REVIEWER FORM

Dear Reviewer,

As the Chief Editor, I would like to thank You for Your scientific contribution, as a reviewer of the STED Journal, to the development of our journal and scientific thought at the PIM University.

Dr Dejan Kojić, Assistant Professor

I kindly ask you to bear in mind that the review must be done and treated as confidential. You are not allowed to show the paper for which you are asked to do the review to the third party. If you want an opinion of colleagues and/or students on the article, first you have to ask for the editor's agreement. You are not allowed to get in touch with the author(s). When submitting the review, bear in mind that all the references which you present will have an impact on the final decision of the chief editor. We kindly ask You to send the completed form to dejan.kojic@univerzitetpim.com, kojic.d@hotmail.com, and/or by post to the address of the PIM University, att Dejan Kojić, Despota Stefana Lazarevića no number, Banja Luka.

Thank You for Your cooperation!

| | |
|--------------------------------------|--|
| Reviewer: | |
| Date of beginning the review: | |
| Title of the paper: | |
| Language: | |
| Date of finishing the review: | |

I kindly ask You to insert a grade for the quality of the paper and its parts in the table below. By double-clicking the field within each grade it becomes possible to choose the field (Checked).

| | <i>I kindly ask You to assess the following (from 5 – excellent to 1 – bad)</i> | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
|----|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1 | Paper significance for the field to which it belongs | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2 | Paper originality and its scientific contribution | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3 | Current interest of the paper | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4 | Structure of the paper | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 5 | Level of the language | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 6 | Adequacy of the research/study method | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 7 | Significance and clearness of drawings, charts and tables | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 8 | Adequacy of the summary as a description of the paper | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 9 | Use and number of key words/key phrases | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 10 | Discussion and results | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 11 | Conclusion | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 12 | Reference list | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

| <i>I kindly ask You to answer the questions putting a tick next to the question.</i> | YES | NO |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Is the paper or its parts plagiarism? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Does the paper contain any kind of fraud? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Is the paper, in general, ethically acceptable? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Is the paper in favour of a certain religion, political group, terrorist group, etc.? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Comments of the reviewer addressed to author(s). We kindly ask you to describe in detail the parts which should be modified and to give concrete advice, so the author(s) could improve their paper.

| | | |
|--|--------------------------|------------------------------------|
| We kindly ask You to give your suggestion for classifying the paper | <input type="checkbox"/> | Original Scientific Paper |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> | Review Paper |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> | Short or Preliminary Communication |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> | Scientific Review |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> | Professional Paper |

Original scientific paper is a paper which is basically organised according to the IMRAD scheme (Introduction, Methods, Results And Discussion) for experimental research or in a descriptive way for descriptive scientific fields, in which one for the first time publishes the text on results of their own research carried out applying the scientific methods, which are described textually and which enable that the research is repeated in case of need, and the established facts are checked.

Review scientific article represents a review of the latest papers of a certain subject field, with the aim to summarise, analyse, synthesise and evaluate the information already published, and moreover it brings new syntheses which also include necessarily the results of the author's own research.

Short or preliminary communication is an original scientific paper, but of a less extent or preliminary character, in which some elements of the IMRAD can be omitted, and it is about summarised presenting the results of a finished original research paper or article which is still in development (Working Paper).

Scientific review, that is, a polemic is a discussion of a certain scientific topic based specifically on scientific argumentation, in which the author proves the correctness of a certain criterion of their opinion, that is, they confirm or reject other authors' findings.

Professional paper is a contribution in which experience useful for improving the professional practice is offered, but which is not necessarily based on a scientific method, that is, the emphasis is on the usability of the results of original research and on spreading knowledge, and the text has to be adjusted to the professional and scientific level of the professional community for who the paper is intended.

| | | |
|---|--------------------------|---|
| We kindly ask You to give your final judgement on this paper choosing one of the options from the menu on the right. | <input type="checkbox"/> | Accept, no modifications needed |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> | Accept, but minor modifications are necessary |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> | Accept, but major modifications are necessary |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> | Reject, bad quality/ off-topic |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> | Reject, ethical issues |

| | |
|---|--|
| Name and surname of the Reviewer | |
| Signature | |