



Prešovská univerzita v Prešove  
Filozofická fakulta

**RECENZNÝ POSUDOK**

**článku**

**Autor(i):** Anastasiya Karnaukh

**Názov:** MACHINE TRANSLATION AND POST-EDITING: EVALUATING QUALITY AND IMPACT ON TRANSLATION PROCESS

*Recenzenti sa vyjadria v tabuľke podľa inštrukcií. Posudok bude poskytnutý anonymne autorovi za účelom úpravy rukopisu. V prípade kladného odporúčania recenzenta bude jeho meno uvedené na rube titulnej strany a v tiráži publikácie.*

**Hodnotenie recenzenta:**

*Jednotlivé časti sa hodnotia nasledovne: číselne od 1 do 5, pričom 1 znamená najnižšie hodnotenie a 5 najvyššie hodnotenie.*

Kritérium	Body
Aktuálnosť obsahu	10
Pôvodný vedecký prínos autora (autorov)	3
Syntéza vlastných a prevzatých poznatkov	4
Logickosť usporiadania – nadväznosť kapitol	4
Práca s odbornou terminológiou	4
Práca s odbornou literatúrou	3
Grafická úprava	10
Kvalita obrázkov a grafov (hodnotí sa, ak sa v článku vyskytujú)	---
Jazyková úroveň	9
Formálna úprava	10
<b>Počet bodov spolu</b>	<b>57</b>

**Komentár recenzenta, prípadné návrhy na úpravu:**

The article under review is in need of substantial revision based on the attached reviewer's detailed comments in the text as it shows serious flaws in its logical structuring and coherence. I recommend that the article should be published only after all attached comments have been integrated. The major problems concern primarily the following:

- there's a mismatch between the title of the article and its content (unfortunately, no evaluation has taken place);
- the aim and the author's own contribution to the topic should be articulated very clearly;
- as this article seems to be based on the author's MA thesis, I'm wondering why the analytical part is missing. If the author meant to stick to an overview paper only, her own contribution remains rather weak although the topic is up-to-date, relevant and has an untapped potential;
- issues with the development of arguments (logic of statement, paragraph transitions, coherence and cohesion need to be improved significantly);
- the author needs to acknowledge secondary sources properly as some parts (e.g. see sections 4 and 6) remain completely deficient in this respect and show disregard for academic writing

conventions;

- it is unclear how the lists that the author uses contribute to the originality and/or message of the article, which calls for a more critical selection of the pieces of information.
- In sum, I recommend that the author include at least some examples from her analytical part of her MA thesis to make her article more valuable, or in the second case scenario, a substantial revision of her arguments is needed in order to arrive at a more coherent and sensible whole.

**Predložený článok odporúčam (zvolenú alternatívu označte krížikom):**

1. publikovať v predloženej podobe \_\_\_\_\_
2. publikovať po zapracovaní navrhnutých úprav \_\_\_X\_\_\_
3. nepublikovať \_\_\_\_\_