

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 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

Review form

Title of the reviewed essay (article entitled):

Name and correspondent address of the reviewer:

Part I. – Please answer the following questions

	Agree wholly	Agree with minor reservation	Agree with major reservation	Disagree
1) The essay is an original piece of scientific work or a surveyed scientific essay not stemming from original research.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2) The title is in accordance to the contents?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3) The essay states clearly its objective and what is achieved.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4) The essay uses appropriate method(s).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5) The essay is free from factual or interpretation mistakes, errors in mathematics or in data processing.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6) The essay is free from irrelevant or redundant material (text/figures/tables).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7) The references are sufficient, appropriate and free from obvious omissions.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8) The abstract adequately summarizes the paper.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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) -