



RHGT
REVIEW OF HISTORICAL
GEOGRAPHY AND TOPONOMASTICS

ISSN 1842-8479, E-ISSN 2393-4255

REVIEW FORM

MANUSCRIPT NUMBER/ID/CODE:	201601
REVIEWER CODE:	02
SUBMISSION DATE:	05 01 2016
REVIEW PERIOD/YEAR:	2016

Dear Reviewer,

Please be so kind to rigorous peer-review the following manuscript submitted to RHGT for possible consideration for publication:

TITLE OF THE MANUSCRIPT

--

1. Is the topic/title of this paper appropriate for Review of Historical Geography and Toponomastics?

<i>Yes, please mark</i>	<i>No, please mark</i>
-------------------------	------------------------

2. You find the paper a useful contribution as: (please mark)

Original research	
A review of important research	
Original research but appropriate as a short communication	

3. How is the overall presentation of the paper?

Low quality	
Satisfactory	
Good	
Very good	
Excellent	

4. Do you find technical weaknesses of approach, instrumentation, analysis or interpretation?

<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>

If, yes, please mention below:

5. Is the title, well designed related to the article content?

<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>

6. Are the key words satisfactory and appropriate for the developed research?

<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>

7. Are the abstract and the conclusions satisfactory?

<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>

Weather there are some commentaries, please mention bellow:

8. Is the manuscript well structured respecting the paper template design of the journal?

<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>

9. Is the length of the paper appropriated to the contribution?

<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>

10. Commentaries on the used language quality. The used English is:

Poor	
Well, it needs minor proof-reading	
Very good	
Excellemt	
other remarks	

11. References (accordingly to the subject analyzed/ not necessarily related to the subject of analysis), correct and appropriated citations, citation from previous issues of the journal (if should be the case), reference format/design:

Reviewer's comment:

12. Would you recommend this paper for publication?

Absolutely, Yes	
Can be published entirely as it is.	
The manuscript requires revisions, which must be satisfactory to the editor	
Could be published, but with major revisions and re-reviewing.	
Could be published, but with minor revisions	
Rejected	

13. Graphical support (original; readable; explanatory; adequate), please comment the quality and the relevance of the graphic material of the manuscript in relation to the developed research

14. Please note/mark: I have no conflict of interest.

15. Comments and recommendations: (use additional space/pages if necessary)

16. Can we start the editorial process?

<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>

Reviewer's signature:¹

Thank you for the valuable contribution to the peer/review process of our journal.

¹The name of the referee/reviewer will remain confidential during the review process)