

### **General instructions**

Before starting the review, please pay attention to the following few lines.

The review is double blind. The editorial board of the journal doesn't purvey names of the authors of reviewed essays to the reviewers and the review form is sent to the authors without the name of the reviewer. The editorial board neither purveys the names of the referees to other persons.

The primary objective of the review is to improve and objectify the decision of the editorial board about accepting the manuscript. The editorial board will provide an anonymous version of the review form to the authors. Extended comments, together with encouraging and constructive criticism concerning possible improvements of the manuscript (in part II) are helpful to both the editors and the authors, and are highly welcomed.

All accepted papers will undergo language editing. Incorrect grammar or style could be the reason for rejecting the paper though its content meets the criterion of a scientific journal.

We are continually widening the list of our referees in order to be able to ensure specialists in the field. If you choose to cooperate in the review process in the future, please provide us with a contact e-mail and the main areas of your specialization.

Contact email .....

Specialization .....

Please, send the review in an electronic form to [nho@econ.muni.cz](mailto:nho@econ.muni.cz) and in printed version with a hand signature to the address of editorial office:

Review of Economic Perspectives  
Faculty of Economics and Administration MU  
Lipová 41a  
602 00 Brno  
Czech Republic

The payment of the arranged reward for the review will be made on the basis of a separate agreement.

### Review form

**Title of the reviewed essay (article entitled):** *please fill in*

**Name and correspondent address of the reviewer:** *please fill in*

#### **Part I. – Please answer the following questions**

- 1) Is the essay an original piece of scientific work or a surveyed scientific essay not stemming from original research? (Y/N)
- 2) Does the essay state clearly what is its objective and what is achieved? (Y/N)
- 3) Does the essay use appropriate method(s)? (Y/N)
- 4) Is the essay free from factual or interpretation mistakes, errors in mathematics or in data processing? (Y/N)
- 5) Is the essay free from irrelevant or redundant material (text/figures/tables)? (Y/N)
- 6) Are the references sufficient, appropriate and free from obvious omissions? (Y/N)
- 7) Is the title in accordance to the contents? (Y/N)
- 8) Does the abstract adequately summarize the paper? (Y/N)

#### **Part II. – Written assessment** (please write at least 1500 characters).

*Please provide a written assessment. If important, elaborate in more detail your opinions concerning your answers from Part I.*

*Please note that extended comments together with encouraging and constructive criticism concerning possible improvements of the manuscript are helpful to both the editors and the authors, and are highly appreciated.*

#### **Part III. – Conclusive assessment and recommendation to the editorial board.**

*According to your opinion, please propose:*

- A) to accept the essay as it is (in this assessed version)
- B) to accept the essay after minor revision
- C) to accept the essay after major revision and re-review
- D) not to accept the essay

In case of C (i.e. if the manuscript is to be revised), should the new version be returned to you for a new assessment? (Y/N)