

Name of reviewer	
Name of author*	
Title of reviewed article	

Date of paper submission:	
Sent to the Reviewer on:	
Review is expected by:	
Date of review submission:	

*due to double blind review process, completed by the editorial board

External Review Form – Evaluation of the Article

Please express your evaluation by explaining with detailed comments (A) and by using the rating scales (2). Authors will appreciate it and will be able to benefit from your evaluation.

(1) QUALITY EVALUATION

No.	Justification for the Evaluation Criteria
1	INTRODUCTION (Does it content the justification for the topic why it is important? Does it include the objective of the article? Does it include brief information on methods (one sentence)? Is the content of each section of the paper briefly described in the last paragraph of the introduction?)
2	LITERATURE REVIEW (Does the paper include a good review of literature in the researched field? Is the literature review comprehensive, complex and logic? Are there main important authors included? Did the Author show the results of other researchers who have dealt with the same problem so far? Were the previous research results identified in the article? Did the Author position himself/herself among the previous researchers? What about the use of recent studies inside the references these published for last five years? Are different options/perspectives from the literature covered in the reviewed article?)
3	METHODOLOGY (Please comment on the accuracy of the research procedure. Are the purpose and rationale for the paper clearly stated? Is the objective of the article proper? Is it met? Are the research hypotheses verified? Is the research problem original and a kind of novelty or is it just the compilation of other studies? Has the Author used the best methods available? What research methods were used? Qualitative or quantitative? Are they properly used? Are they enough advanced for the scientific article? Is their application correct? Is the presentation of the research method accurate?)
4	RESULTS AND FINDINGS (Please comment on the description of the research analysis and findings. Is the reasoning sound? Has the Author given the appropriate interpretation of the data and references? Are the results discussed in details? Are the pieces of information used inside the paper comes from reliable sources (either written or various data bases)? What is the likelihood of passing the "test of time"?)

5	DISCUSSION (The process of developing the argument in a manner that is understandable, logical and concrete, demonstrating the significance of the research results by placing them in a comparative context . Are the findings in the article compared to findings of other authors?)
6	CONCLUSION (Conclusions with specific solutions to the outlined problems and recommendations for researchers and relevant business practice. Does this part include FOUR compulsory elements , namely (1) general summary of the article, its results and findings, (2) implications and recommendations for practice, (3) research limitations, and last but not least (4) suggestions for future research?)
7	CONTRIBUTION TO THE FIELD AND DEPTH OF RESEARCH (Advancement of knowledge. Does the paper make a significant contribution to the research theme? 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?)

(2) RATING SCALE (Please evaluate each criterion on the scale from 1 to 5)

For any 1-3 evaluations the Author is obliged to revise the article accordingly.

No.	Evaluation Criteria (while evaluating please use the explanations indicated below the evaluation table)	1	2	3	4	5
		poor	below average	average	good	excellent
1	INTRODUCTION					
2	LITERATURE REVIEW					
3	METHODOLOGY					
4	RESULTS AND FINDINGS					
5	DISCUSSION					
6	CONCLUSION					
7	CONTRIBUTION TO THE FIELD					
OVERALL EVALUATION (from 1 to 35 points based on the above marks, articles with less than 21 points will not be published, however we aim at 30)						

(3) PUBLICATION RECOMMENDATION (check one) /Tick (X) /

<input type="checkbox"/>	Publish as is with high recommendation (The quality of the article is excellent, thus the article accepted for publication without any changes)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Accept with minor suggested modification specified in reviewer's comments (The article accepted for publication after minor changes)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Accept with major suggested modification specified in reviewer's comments (The article can be accepted for publication only after major changes)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Revise and resubmit, with suggested modification specified in reviewer's comments (The article can be accepted for publication only with major revisions)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Reject because of inappropriate material or inadequate quality. (The article is not eligible for publication as it does not meet minimal international standards)

Reviewer's Additional Comments and Suggestions for the Author (optional)

.....

.....

Reviewer's Remarks only for the Editorial Board (optional)

.....

.....

Reviewer's Declaration

I agree to publish my name on the list of all reviewers at the journal's website according to the Polish law and the needs of the journal evaluation criteria.

Signature of the reviewer
(required only for scanned version):

.....

Dear Reviewer, we do thank you for your time and precious suggestions for the Author and us!

If not filled in within the OJS system, please return it to the Editorial Board of EBER:

- 1) in the MS WORD electronic editable form for the author**
- 2) as the PDF scanned (or printed-out) version with your signature for the archive purpose**

e-mail: eber@uek.krakow.pl

postal address:

EBER, c/o Prof. Krzysztof Wach, PhD, Editor-in-Chief,
Cracow University of Economics, ul. Rakowicka 27, 31-510 Kraków, Poland