

Title of the paper:

Criteria	Unacceptable		Below average		Average		Good		Very Good	
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Originality of the paper										
Quality of the language										
Relationship of the content to the title of the paper										
Presentation of current theory in the field										
Empirical contribution										
Quality of the methods used										

Formal criteria of scientific paper	Yes	No
Does abstract outline the background, objectives, methodology, data, results and main contribution of the paper.		
Does introduction outline clearly the objectives, motivation for writing the paper and aims of the research? It should provide a context for the discussion in the body of the paper.		
Has the paper a separate subchapter devoted to the description of methodology?		
Does conclusions provide a neat summary of the main discussion of the paper?		
Is the bibliography appropriate and up to date?		

Formal editorial quality of the paper	Yes	No
Is the structure of the article up to the requirements?		
Are the tables and charts adjusted to the requirements?		
Are the References adjusted to DOI requirements?		
Are the References adjusted to Harvard norms – APA styles (American Psychological Association 6th edition)		

Evaluation: 0-3 the paper cannot be published; 4-7 the paper can be published after including corrections suggested by the reviewer; 8-9 unconditional recommendation for publishing of the paper

Comments of the reviewer:

Conclusions:

I recommend publishing of the article in current form.	
I recommend publishing of the article after corrections.	
I recommend rejection of the article.	

Note to Reviewer:

The referee should especially comment the criteria, which are rated as unacceptable or below average. Comments for the authors should refer to text fragment (in the form of citation or reference to paragraph or page number).