The editors ask reviews to read the following guidelines before preparing the evaluation.

The reviewers are asked to apply the following evaluation grades:

Very Good		When the given criterion is fully perfect, if no changes are needed.
8	**9**	
Good		When the given criterion is mostly perfect and only some minor changes are needed.
6	**7**	
Average		When the given criterion needs some improvements. In that case the editors ask the reviewers to point in details what should be changed.
4	**5**	
Below Average		When the given criterion needs many significant improvements. In that case the editors ask the reviewers to point in details the weaknesses.
2	**3**	
Unacceptable		When the article cannot be improved and should re-written.
0	**1**	

Evaluation: 0-3 the paper cannot be published; 4-7 the paper can be published after including corrections suggested by the reviewer; 8-9 unconditional recommendation for publishing of the paper

Criterions	Check list
Originality of the paper	Is the subject of the article novel? Is the scientific problem up to date? Is the scientific problem important form the theoretical perspective or business and economic practice?
Quality of the language	Is the language quality at sufficient level? Is the language grammar correct? Is the article written in appropriate scientific style? Does the author use the proper academic terminology specific for the research theme?
Relationship of the content to the title of the paper	Is the title reflective of the paper's contents? Does the title provide sufficient information to the potential reader? Is the title proper and suitable to the article? Does it express the studied problem? Is the title wider/narrower than the content of the article?
Presentation of current theory in the field	Is the relevant literature sufficiently presented? Is the literature review comprehensive, complex and logic? Are there main important authors in the field included? Has the author presented the results of other researchers who dealt with the same problem? Have been the previous research results identified in the article? Has the author positioned himself among the previous researchers?
Empirical contribution	Does the article make a significant contribution to the research in the field? Wherein the solution to the problem proposed by the author of the article differs from those available in the literature? Does the article bring something new? Are there implications and recommendations?
Quality of the	Is the methodological rigor of the article at sufficient level?

methods used	The article must provide detailed information on the applied methods. The information on methodology must include: a) dates of research (field work) or time period of the analyzed data; b) data sources used and the empirical research; c) description of the data collection methods and source of the data (e.g., national/international official statistics, surveys, interviews, observations, experiments, content analysis etc.); d) in the case of presentation of survey results: structure of the population, type of the sample, its size and information about its adjustments, as well as sampling error; type of the questions (e.g., open, closed, semi-closed, etc.); authors of methodological tools; e) description of the methods of data analysis (e.g., also in the case of basic statistical methods such as estimating correlation coefficients – their statistical dependencies must be indicated; when using factor analysis – the percentage of explained variance has to be provided); f) brief summary on the positive and negative aspects of applied methods: testing of methodological tools, difficulties in the implementation of the initial research concept, discovery of the problems with the methodological tools, unpredictable organizational and methodical situations; g) in the main body of the article the author must directly refer to all tables and figures, for example: "Figure 1 presents the results…"; "The results of the research given in figure 1 indicate…". When formatting tables one should indicate specific information about the provided data.

Formal criterions of scientific paper: Yes, Partially: it should be improved, No	
Abstract	Is the abstract up to the demanded structure? Research background: Purpose of the article: Methods: Findings & Value added:
Introduction	Does introduction outline clearly the objectives, motivation for writing the paper and aims of the research? Introduction should provide a context for the discussion in the body of the paper.
Methodology	Has the paper a separate subchapter devoted to the description of methodology?
Discussion	Has the paper a separate subchapter devoted to the discussion?
Conclusions	Does conclusions provide a neat summary of the main discussion of the paper?
Bibliography	Is the bibliography appropriate and up to date?

Formal editorial quality of the paper: Yes, Partially: it should be improved, No	
Is the structure of the article up to the requirements?	Does the article have the following main parts: 1. Introduction 2. Conceptual part/literature review 3. Methodology presentation 4. Empirical/analytical part 5. Discussion 6. Conclusions 7. References Is something missed in particular parts? Is the structure logic, clear and proper?
Tables and Charts	Are the tables and charts adjusted to the requirements? Are all the tables and charts placed in the Annex? Are there direct references to all the tables and charts in the main-body of the article?

	Is the English metric system applied in the tables and Charts (1.00 is correct / 1,00 is incorrect for decimal numbers).
References – DOI sysem	Are the References adjusted to DOI requirements?
Harvard norms – APA styles	Are the References adjusted to Harvard norms – APA styles (American Psychological Association 6th edition)

Comments of the Reviewer:

The reviews are asked for comments of the criterions that were asses with grades below 6.

Conclusion – the reviewer is asked to point his final recommendation.

I recommend publishing of the article in the current form.	
I recommend publishing of the article after corrections.	**X**
I recommend publishing of the article after corrections under condition of additional review.	
I recommend that the article should be rejected.	