

Criteria for the evaluation of the written paper

Theoretical background and contribution to the literature (0–10 points)

- Is the topic **important and current** in terms of the given field and methodology?
- Does the TDK paper clearly situate the topic within the relevant **scholarly** and/or practical **context**? Are the presentation of relevant concepts, models and theories professional and coherent?
- Is the **main problem**, research question, objective or innovation aim clearly identified? In the case of empirical research, are the examined **hypothesis(es)** clear, professionally justified, and directed at essential relationships of the topic?
- Is it clearly demonstrated **what the paper contributes** to the existing knowledge of the field (e.g. new empirical results, theoretical synthesis, methodological/innovative contribution, etc.)?

Methods and approach (0–10 Points)

- Does the chosen methodological approach (empirical research, theoretical comparative work, case study, method or program description, innovation, etc.) **fit the stated objective/question**?
- Are the **methods** (e.g. sample, measurement tools, analytical procedures; theoretical perspectives, source selection; development steps) presented in **sufficient transparency and detail** to allow the work to be assessed and reproduced?
- Is the process (research, analysis, development, implementation) **professionally sound, justified and consistent**?
- Was the **research/analysis/innovation** conducted appropriately (e.g. sample size and suitability, sampling method, ethical approval where necessary)?

Results/product and their presentation (0–10 points)

- Is it clearly identifiable **what the concrete result or product of the paper is?**
 - in empirical work: data, findings, statistical/qualitative outputs;
 - in theoretical work: new model, synthesis, conceptual framework;
 - in methodological/innovative work: new or adapted method, tool, program, protocol, etc.
- Is the presentation of results **logical, clear and focused?** Do figures, tables, diagrams, flowcharts, etc. **support understanding?**
- Do the results **clearly relate to the** previously **formulated objectives/questions/hypotheses?**
- **What is the scientific value of the presented results? The paper must contain independent and novel research results.**

Interpretation and broader context (0–10 points)

- Does the author not only describe but also **interpret the results/product** (what they mean and why they are important)? Are independent conclusions and recommendations based on analytical work presented? **The conclusions are grounded in the hypotheses and well-founded:** does the author draw only those conclusions that are supported by the collected data?
- Is the connection to the **broader scholarly, theoretical, practical or social context established?**
- Does the author realistically and critically indicate the **limitations** of the work (e.g. sample, methods, generalizability, implementation constraints, potential biases)? Are these limitations considered when formulating conclusions?
- Are **practical recommendations and directions for further research or development** provided?

Structure and style (0–10 points)

- Is the structure of the paper **logical and clear**, and appropriate to the type of work (e.g. introduction – theoretical background – methods/approach – results/product – interpretation – conclusion)?

- Are **the proportions, structure and progression of sections balanced** and easy to follow? Is the title consistent with the content? Do subheadings accurately reflect their sections?
- Is **the style scientific/professional yet understandable?** How precise, linguistically refined and free from errors is the text?
- Do **figures, tables, appendices and references conform to academic standards**, are they consistently formatted and properly cited, and do they effectively complement the main text?