

**internet Antitrust and Regulatory Quarterly
(iKAR)**

Review form

We want to thank you for your willingness to review an article for iKAR, an academic and professional periodical published by CARS, dedicated to the fundamental problems of antitrust and sector regulation in Poland, the EU and the world and addressed to all academic and professional communities in this field.

We especially thank you for your willingness to review the submitted article for iKAR in a double-blind peer review system, in which the authors do not know the reviewers and the reviewers do not know the authors.

We would also appreciate your adherence to the following review rules.

- 1. Competence:** A reviewer who do not feel qualified to review the received article or perceives a conflict of interest should return it immediately to the subject editor - no later than 7 days.
- 2. Suspicion of plagiarism and violation of the principles of scientific integrity:** a reviewer who suspects that the article under review violates another party's copyrights,

including the ghostwriting or guest authorship, should inform the thematic editor when submitting the review at the latest.

3. **Clear formulation of opinions:** the review should be done on the review form; however, if less than 8 points are awarded in a given category, the reviewer should justify their negative or critical opinions; they may also formulate recommendations for the author.
4. **Recommendation to the Editorial Board:** editors are asked to make a clear recommendation as to the appropriateness of publishing an article in iKAR according to the following rules: (a) acceptance for publication: 38-50 pts; (b) acceptance after minor revisions: 30-37 pts; (c) referral for supplementation: 36-20 pts; (d) rejection: less than 20 pts.
5. **Ethical rules:** reviewers must adhere to iKAR's ethical rules and follow the designated guidelines for reviewers.
6. **Time:** reviewers are asked to return reviews within 14 days.

The full range of rules for the procedure can be found on the [iKAR website](#).

Publication title:

.....

.....

Rating

Evaluation criteria	Points (0–10)
<p>1. Topics</p> <p>Does the text deal with an issue covered by the IKAR profile? Does the text deal with an issue relevant to the IKAR profile? Does the article complement (add value or systematize) the existing state of knowledge?</p>	
<p>2. Content and layout</p> <p>Is the content of the article consistent with the title? Are the structure of the text and the flow of the argument correct and lead to proving the article's thesis? Are the theses of the article posed correctly? Is the argument presented clearly?</p>	

<p>3. Selection and use of literature</p> <p>Does the text make use of the existing state of knowledge (domestic and foreign literature, results of empirical studies) on the given issue? Is the selection of literature appropriate (in terms of the validity of the theories presented, their relevance to the problem addressed, the assumptions made for the analysis)?</p>	
<p>4. Scientific workshop</p> <p>Is the study methodology used in the article appropriate? Has the study been designed correctly, and are the results obtained not questionable? Is the presentation of the data and results of the study (e.g., tables, graphs) correct, and their number is not questionable?</p>	
<p>5. Relevance</p> <p>Are the problems presented in the article relevant to the current state of economic knowledge and regulatory practice? Can the conclusions of the text be applied to practical regulatory actions?</p>	
<p>Total (0–50)</p>	

Detailed negative and critical comments

.....

Reviewer's position

Based on the evaluation made above, I recommend to the Editorial Board (mark with "X"):

- ACCEPT THE ARTICLE FOR PUBLICATION
- ACCEPT FOR PUBLICATION AFTER MINOR REVISIONS
- SEND BACK TO THE AUTHOR WITH A REQUEST FOR CHANGES
- REJECT