**Review of an article submitted for publication in**

***European Management Studies***

Article title: ...............................................................................................................................

Reviewer (for the Editors’ information only)

Full name, academic title/degree: .....................................................................................................

Organization: .....................................................................................................................................

Contact: .............................................................................................................................................

|  |
| --- |
|[ ]  I declare that I have familiarized myself and accept the rules of publishing ethics of *EUROPEAN MANAGEMENT STUDIES.* |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Basic information:** | **Yes** | **To some extent** | **No** |
| Does the paper title correspond to its content? |  |  |  |
| Does the paper contribute to the development of the Organisation and Management Studies? |  |  |  |

DETAILED REVIEWER’S COMMENTS

|  |
| --- |
| **1. Originality:** Does the paper contain new and/or original information adequate to justify publication? |
|  |
| **2. Literature:** Is the paper based on relevant and current literature? Is the literature up to date? Is any significant work ignored? Does the paper demonstrate an adequate understanding of the relevant literature? |
|  |
| **3. Methodology**: assessment of methodological accuracy (matching the formulated problem and objective, clarity of the method description, correctness of reasoning); does the methodological approach is reasoned and match to the current stock of knowledge? |
|  |
| **4. Results and implications:** Are results presented clearly? Are the results (data) analysed properly? Are conclusions adequate? Is there a discussion of results? Does the paper identify implications for research/theory, practice, and /or society? Are the implications consistent with the results and conclusions |
|  |
| **5. Specific comments to the author** (e.g. structure, logical reasoning, factual adequacy, language, etc.) |
|  |
| **6. Overall assessment** |
|  |
| **7. Confidential comments to the Editors** |
|  |

FINAL RECOMMENDATION

|  |
| --- |
| **Recommendation. The article (tick one option):** |
| is suitable for publishing in its current form (accept) |  |
| requires minor revision and changes  |  |
| requires major revision  |  |
| should be rejected |  |