

## 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- ☐ 1 - out of date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- ☐ 1 - out of date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**