Military University Institute

IUM Research and Development Centre
(CIDIUM)

***Portuguese Journal of Military Sciences* – Reviewer file**

Date sent to the reviewer: ____ / ____ / ____
Date returned by the reviewer: ____ / ____ / ____

Article

Title: _____

Reviewer

Full name: _____

Title *(academic)*: _____

Rank *(military)*: _____

Affiliation: _____

Institution: _____

Unit, body, or service: _____

Place: Post code / City: Country:

Contacts: *Email:* Tel.:

Article review

1. Comments on content:

1.1. Interest, methodology, and timeliness:

	Good	Sufficient	Insufficient
a. Scientific interest of the work with particular relevance to Military Science			
b. Methodology and sources			
c. Timeliness and relevance of the bibliographic references			

1.2. Necessary changes:

	Yes	No
a. Should any part of the text be more developed?		
b. Should any part of the text be more succinct?		
c. Should any part of the text be removed?		
d. Are there any obvious gaps in the bibliographic references?		

1.3. If applicable, list the points that should be improved:

2. Notes on style:

	Good	Sufficient	Insufficient
1. Quality of writing			
2. Organisation of the work			
3. Is the title informative and does it correspond to the contents of the work?			

2.1. If applicable, list the points that should be improved

Information sent to the author

Final appraisal

1. Can the article be published?

Yes, in its current form.	
Yes, with some corrections.	
It should not be published.	

2. Please list the corrections you find necessary in light of the appraisal (*Note: Filling-out this section is crucial to the review process because, in addition to point 1 above, this is the only information available to the author).*