

POLISH JOURNAL OF AESTHETICS

Text Review

Title of paper:

Author's name¹:

Reviewer's name²:

A. Overall assessment of the paper³:

- acceptable in present form;
- acceptable on condition that suggested alterations are made,
 - after which it should be reviewed one more time;
 - after which it need not be reviewed again.
- cannot be accepted by the PJA as a scholarly article because
 - it does not sufficiently fulfil scholarly criteria;
 - the subject matter is beyond the range of philosophy.

B. Weak points of the text:

1. insufficiently clear;
2. the opinions/statements are insufficiently justified;
3. the cited literature on the discussed subject is insufficiently extensive;
4. it does not make a sufficient contribution to the discussed discipline;
5. works by other authors are not used in an entirely permissible way;
6. it is too long/it contains redundant footnotes;
7. it is linguistically incorrect in some places;
8. it has not been thoroughly edited in terms of typography;
9. the title does not sufficiently reflect the content;
10. the summary is not sufficiently informative.

C. Justifications and possible suggestions concerning the above remarks:

¹ The name will be inserted once the review is completed.

² The name is not revealed to the author.

³ Please choose **one** of the options by placing an *x* in the square brackets.

D. Suggested changes:

E. Assessment specification⁴:

On a scale ranging from 0 to 3, the text is graded as follows:

- | | |
|---|-----|
| 1. clarity, cohesion and argumentation | [] |
| 2. reliability of the use of quoted works | [] |
| 3. originality and significance | [] |
| 4. linguistic correctness | [] |

F. Optional supplementation and justification of the above assessment:

⁴ Opinions in **E** and **F** are for the editorial staff only. Please fill in only if you accept the text for publication.