

MUSIC COGNITION

REVIEW FORM

Title of the paper: [Insert Title]

Reviewer: [Insert Reviewer's Name]

To be sent before: 15 of April 2026

a. Synthetic Evaluation

Please evaluate according to the following scale: 1 (Poor), 2 (Acceptable), 3 (Fair), 4 (Good), 5 (Excellent)

Main Criteria	1 (Poor)	2 (Acceptable)	3 (Fair)	4 (Good)	5 (Excellent)
Originality and relevance of the contribution	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Coherent and well-developed argumentation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Language correctness	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overall scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Organization/Structure of the paper	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Validity of conclusions	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Knowledge and use of the bibliography	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

a. Review Summary and Essential Suggestions (Reviewer's comments)

Provide a concise evaluative summary, including suggested corrections, improvements to the title and keywords, updates to the bibliography, and recommendations for further improvement.

b. Conclusive Evaluation (Reviewer's recommendations)

Recommendation for publication (mark one):

The paper is highly innovative and very well organized. Consequently it is accepted for publication.

The paper is coherent, consistent with the suggested topic and well organized. I recommend the publication with the following minor changes:

The paper is coherent and consistent with the suggested topic. I recommend the publication with the following changes and revisions:

The paper is unclear or unrelated to the topic and it is rejected for to the following reasons:

Please return to: National Academy of Music Gheorghe Dima, e-mail:
cognitie.muzicala@amgd.ro

We will be grateful for any comments of suggestions that could help us improve our publication policy, and the refereeing procedure.

Date

Signature