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**Please mark an (x) (click the relevant box) in the checklist to address the different aspects of the manuscript. In accordance with the guidelines of SICRIS, it is necessary to add the content justification (notes) of the reviewed manuscript. Please note, any issues or concerns with the manuscript should be commented under item Reviewer's Specific Observations and Argumentations!**

**DETERMINING THE PROFESSIONAL FIELD**

☐ the manuscript falls within the fields of architecture, landscape architecture, urban design and spatial planning in the narrow sense

☐ the manuscript falls within the wider scope in the fields mentioned above (e.g. geography, urban sociology, regional economics)

☐ the paper does not belong to any of the fields in spatial sciences mentioned above, either in the narrow or the wider sense

**REVIEWER'S NOTES ON MANUSCRIPT (content** **justification in few sentences)**

Click here to add text.

**FORMAT OF MANUSCRIPT**

☐ there is only the actual title of the manuscript

☐ there is a subtitle

☐ the manuscript has an abstract in Slovene

☐ the abstract is presented correctly

☐ the manuscript includes non-mandatory components, such as terminology lists and definitions, acknowledgements, appendices ...

☐ the appendices are correctly placed after references

☐ the appendices are correctly marked

☐ the contents of the appendices is appropriate

☐ the manuscript includes a longer extract (or extracts) from the works of other authors

☐ the author has adequate permission for the publication of such an extract

☐ figures and/or tables are adequately numbered

☐ figures and/or tables are adequately captioned

☐ in the text, the author refers to the figures and/or tables

☐ the manuscript is within the length limit (5000 words)

**COMPLIANCE WITH STANDARDS OF STYLE AND EXPRESSION**

☐ correct use of language

☐ proper terminology

☐ appropriate formation of paragraphs, sections and chapters

☐ the measurements are expressed in SI units

☐ names, symbols and a special nomenclature are properly presented

☐ numeric expressions for dates and time are correct

☐ citations are correct

☐ appropriate use of non-verbal means (figures and tables)

☐ bibliographic descriptions in references and/or bibliography are correct

**SCIENTIFIC QUALITY OF THE RESEARCH AND THE MANUSCRIPT**

☐ original problem

☐ non-original problem, repetition and confirmation of other results

☐ broadening of the topic with some original components

☐ an overview of the state-of-the-art in the field

☐ professional (not a research) topic

☐ the treated topic is relevant and important

☐ the demarcation between the author's contribution and the contribution of other authors is clear (the author's contribution to the treated topic is beyond dispute)

☐ the title (and subtitle) correspond(s) to the contents of the paper

☐ the title gives enough information and contains key words

☐ the purpose of the paper is clearly defined

☐ the attitude towards similar previous works is adequately described

☐ the methods and techniques used are reliable

☐ the description of the methods and techniques gives enough detail, so that the research/expert work can be repeated

☐ the amount of the given data is sufficient

☐ the argumentation is clear and convincing

☐ the description of results contains mistakes (typing mistakes and similar)

☐ the results are commented and critiqued

☐ the conclusion includes a summary of previous theses, their synthesis and the validity of the initial hypothesis

☐ the bibliography should be completed and enlarged

**ACCURACY OF RESULTS**

☐ accurate

☐ disputable

☐ not accurate

**CLASSIFICATION OF THE TYPE OF THE MANUSCRIPT**

☐original scientific article

☐ review article

☐ short scientific article

☐ professional article

☐ review, book review, critique

☐ **polemic, discussion**

☐ interview

☐ popular article

☐ other articles and essays
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☐ publication recommended without revisions

☐ publication recommended with minor revisions, a second review is not necessary

☐ conditional acceptance with major revisions; the manuscript must be revised according to the reviewer's comments

☐ not suitable and rejected for publication

☐ manuscript is better suited for publication in another journal such as (the suggestion is optional): Click here to add text.
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