



REVIEW FORM

Title of paper reviewed:

[Empty box for title of paper reviewed]

A. CATEGORY AND GENERAL NATURE OF PAPER

Please, tick one or more answers.

- A.1. Review (systematising)
- A.2. Empirical (based on own research)
- A.3. Methodological
- A.4. Applied
- A.5. Other (state)

B. ASSESSMENT OF CONTENT

	Definitely yes	Rather yes	Rather not	Definitel y not
B.1. Is it an original contribution in the English language literature, i.e. does not repeat work in previous publications?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
B.2. Are the issues discussed important in relation to the overall topic addressed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
B.3. Does the paper offer an original contribution to the literature on the topic and current state of the art?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
B.4. Is the paper likely to appeal to a wider range of specialists in the area covered and to elicit a wide response?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

C. ASSESSMENT OF STRUCTURE AND PREPARATION OF THE PAPER

Please skip questions not applicable to the type of paper submitted. Questions C.5 to C.9 are particularly important for empirical papers.

C.1. Does the title correspond with the content?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
C.2. Is the topic presented clearly and understandably?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
C.3. Does the paper use the necessary (relevant) literature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
C.4. Is the breakdown into main sections logical and justified?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
C.5. Is the terminology correct and sufficiently well	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>



explained?

C.6. Has the methodology been described and is it understandable and replicable?

C.7. Are the data sources described and are they sufficient for the research results desired?

C.8. Are the contents and quantity of figures and tables justified?

C.9. Are the conclusions drawn from the analysis adequate?

D. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS OF THE REVIEWER

Please feel free to make comments longer than suggested by the size of the field below. They may refer either to specific questions in this form (e.g. B.1, B.2, etc.), or to any other matters the reviewer finds important.

Miscellaneous corrections and comments may also be marked either within the digital file of the paper (highlights, comments, corrections, all in the track changes mode) or on a printout.



E. GENERAL ASSESSMENT ON MERIT

E.1. General assessment on merit on a scale of 1 to 5 (1 – very poor, 5 – very good):

E.2. The paper:

Is fit for publishing without major changes, only minor corrections

Is fit for publishing subject to significant changes (including structural) and corrections

Is not fit for publishing



Confidential information only to be seen by the Editors:

--	--

Name of the reviewer

Date