

Management

Please do not fill in and submit this PDF as your review. The final review should be sent only via **electronic form** available in Editorial System.

Please, evaluate the article and mark „x” in particular parts of the column, „5” refers to the best „1” – the worst. The articles with minimum 60 points of the review will be published in the journal.

1. Evaluation of the scientific problem (20 points)

Aim of the article 1/2

- 1 - not defined
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5 - clearly defined

Aim of the article 2/2

- 1 - insignificant
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5 - significant

Contribution of the article to science

- 1 - not innovative
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5 - significant

Implementation of the aim

- 1 - not realized
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5 - realized

2. Evaluation of the substantive value (50 points)

Problem concerning management and/or economics 1/3

- 1 - irrelevant
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5 - relevant

Problem concerning management and/or economics 2/3

- 1 - out of date
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5 - current

Problem concerning management and/or economics 3/3

- 1 - not genuine
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5 - genuine

Title 1/2

- 1 - incompatible with the contents
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5 - compatible with the contents

Title 2/2

- 1 - inappropriately formulated
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5 - appropriately formulated

Conclusions

- 1 - inappropriate
- 2
-

- 3
- 4
- 5 - appropriate

Application value

- 1 - narrow
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5 - broad

Structure

- 1 - inappropriate
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5 - appropriate

Terminology

- 1 - not professional
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5 - professional

Communication / intelligibility

- 1 - vague
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5 - clear

3. Evaluation of scientific methods, techniques, literature (20 points)

Scope of research

- 1 - superficial
- 2
- 3
- 4
-

5 - broad

Research methods and techniques

- 1 - inadequate to the problem
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5 - adequate to the problem

Literature

- 1 - out of date
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5 - current

References

- 1 - inadequate to editorial requirements
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5 - adequate to editorial requirements

4. Formal evaluation (10 points)

Editing correctness

- 1 - inappropriate
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5 - appropriate

Summary and article contents

- 1 - inadequate
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5 - adequate

5. Reviewer's declaration

- I do not know the identity of the Author/s of the reviewed article
- I know the identity of the Author/s but there is no conflict of interest

6. Reviewer conclusion

- The article can be published without corrections
- The article can be published after introducing suggested changes and corrections
- The article requires thorough changes therefore it should be re-reviewed after introducing suggested corrections
- The article cannot be qualified for publishing

7. Information for Editors (not visible for authors)

8. Information for Authors