

## Review

Please send a filled-in form to: [art.history@vdu.lt](mailto:art.history@vdu.lt)

The title of the article	
Date	

### I CONTENT

#### 1. The presentation of the problem / the object of research

	Clear and comprehensive
	Needs to be complemented
	Unclear

**Comment:**

#### 2. Theoretical substantiation

	Author's original approach
	Sufficiently based on previous research
	Not sufficiently based on previous research
	Correct relationship to previous research
	No correct relationship to previous research
	The theoretical basis is missing

**Comment:**

#### 3. The originality and relevance of the problem / the object of research

	New information is presented
	Information is relevant in Lithuanian / global art history and criticism
	The new interpretation of information
	Repetition of an already-known thing
	Originality and relevance are missing

**Comment:**

#### 4. The level of scientific argumentation

	Consistent and comprehensive scientific argumentation
	Sufficient scientific argumentation
	Insufficient scientific argumentation, needs to be complemented
	The level of description, scientific argumentation is missing

**Comment:**

### 5. The validity of the conclusions

	Conclusions consistently sum up the research
	Conclusions are fragmentary
	Conclusions are missing

**Comment**

## II FORM

### 6. The clarity of the article's title

	Clear enough
	Needs corrections

**Comment:**

### 7. Informative level of the summary

	Informative enough
	Needs to be complemented

**Comment:**

### 8. The list of the keywords

	Clear enough
	Needs corrections

**Comment:**

### 9. Illustrations, tables, etc.

	Relevant (related to the text)
	Not informative
	Too many illustrations/tables

**Comment:**

### 10. References

	Presented correctly
	Necessary to make corrections
	References are missing

**Comment:**

### III REVIEW ON THE USE OF GENERATIVE AI (ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE) IN RESEARCH

#### 11. The evaluation of the use of generative AI in research

	Generative AI in research not used
	Responsible use of generative AI in research: use of generative AI transparent – is provided information on the role of generative AI in the research activities proposed and carried out, in line with the accountability principle that emphasises responsibility and human oversight
	Not responsible use of generative AI in research: should be detailed which generative AI tools have been used substantially in the research process, researchers should transparently note its use in the methods section (or equivalent) responsibly evaluating the extent of the contribution, references to the tool should include the name, version, date, etc. and how it was used and affected the research process
	Inappropriate use of generative AI in research

**Comment:**

### IV EVALUATION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

#### 12. The evaluation of the content

	Can be published without corrections
	Minor corrections in content need to be made
	Not comprehensive, important corrections need to be made (needs to be reviewed once more)
	Inappropriate

**Comment:**

#### 13. The evaluation of the form

	Appropriate
	Appropriate after corrections (as specified in II part)
	Inappropriate

**Comment:**