EBER

Entrepreneurial Business and Economics Review

Name of reviewer*	Prof. Dr. **Adam Johanson** (Georgetown University)
Name of author**	
Title of reviewed paper	**How to be a good reviewer for EBER?**
Date of submission	31 January 2014
Date of review	11 February 2014

*please provide your full name, scientific degrees/titles and university affiliation, we will not reveal your name to the author(s)
**due to double blind review process, completed by the editorial board

Review Form – Evaluation of the Paper
(Please read the guidelines for reviewers before preparing the evaluation)

Use the following evaluation grades:

Good	If the particular criterion is fully or mostly perfect, if no changes are needed or if some **minor changes** are needed
Average	If the particular criterion needs some improvements, if so, please precise in details what should be changed, use this evaluation if some **significant minor changes** are needed
Poor	If the particular criterion needs many improvements, if so, please precise in details what should be changed, use this evaluation if some **major changes** are needed, or if the text can't be improved easily and should be re-written
N/A (not applicable)	if the particular criterion can't be applied to the particular article due to its specifics

* Tick (X) the selected evaluation and **provide with a brief justification for the evaluation**, please.

No	Evaluation Criteria	Reviewer's Evaluation*			
		Good	Average	Poor	N/A
1	**Title** (consistency of paper's content with the title)				
	Justification and Comments (optional if the title is perfect): **Is the title reflective of the paper's contents?** Is the title proper and suitable to the text? Does it express the studied problem? Is the title wider/narrower than the content of the article? Do you suggest any changes of the title?				
2	**Abstract** (consistency of abstract with paper's content, required abstract structure)				
	Justification and Comments: **Is the abstract accurate and informative?** Does the abstract represent an accurate briefing of the paper content and (if considered necessary) of the conclusions?				
3	**Structure of the paper** (consistency with required structure, clarity, narrative)				
	Justification and Comments: **Is the paper well organized?** Does the article have 3 main parts (1: introduction, **2: conceptual part** i.e. literature review or development, **3: methodological assumption**, **4: analytical part**, 5: conclusions, 6: references)? Do you miss something in particular parts? Is the structure logic, clear and proper? **Is the paper too long / too short? (We prefer ca. 15 pages, 1,5 interline, 12 pt. Times)**				

* * *

Please return it to the Editorial Board of EBER:
1) in the MS WORD electronic editable form for the author
2) as the PDF scanned (or printed-out) version with your signature for the archive purpose

4	**Research problem** (aim and hypothesis formulation, clarity, originality and novelty)				
	Justification and Comments: **Are the purpose and rationale for the paper clearly stated?** Is there the aim/objective/goal? Is it proper? Is it met? Is there any research hypothesis (if it is the empirical article)? Is it proper? Is it verified? Is there any theoretical proposition (if it is the review article)? Is it proper? Is it reached? Is the research problem original and a kind of novelty or is it just the compilation of other studies?				
5	**Literature review** (quality of theoretical background, complexity and logic)				
	Justification and Comments: **Is the relevant literature sufficiently consulted?** Does the paper include a good review of literature in the researched field? Is the literature review comprehensive, complex and logic? Are there main important authors included? Did the author show the results of other researchers who dealt with the same problem? Were the previous research results identified in the article? Did the author position himself/herself among the previous researchers? What about the use of recent studies inside the references (last five years)?				
6	**Research methods** (choice of methods, correctness of application)				
	Justification and Comments: **Has the author used the best methods available?** What research methods were used? Qualitative or quantitative? Are they properly used? Are they enough advanced for the scientific article? Is their application correct? Is the presentation of the research method accurate?				
7	**Findings** (clarity of presentation and interpretation)				
	Justification and Comments: **Is the reasoning sound?** **Has the author given the appropriate interpretation of the data and references?** Are the results discussed in details? Are the pieces of information used inside the paper comes from reliable sources (either written or various data bases)? What is the likelihood of passing the "test of time"?				
8	**Contribution** (value added, suggestions for further research, practical implications)				
	Justification and Comments: **Does the paper make a significant contribution to the research theme?** Wherein the solution to the problem proposed by the author of the article differs from those available in the literature? Does the article bring something new? Are there implications and recommendations? What is the importance of conclusions for practice? Did the author mention directions for further research in the studied problem?				
9	**Language, bibliography and editorial requirements** (quality, use of academic terminology and citations)				
	Justification and Comments: **Is the paper written in appropriate style?** **Are the illustrations and tables suitable, necessary and of publishable quality?** Does the author use the proper academic terminology specific for the research theme? Are the citations and references quoted properly according to the Harvard style?				

* * *

Please return it to the Editorial Board of EBER:
1) in the MS WORD electronic editable form for the author
2) as the PDF scanned (or printed-out) version with your signature for the archive purpose

What about the use of recent studies inside the references (last five years)?
Are any lacks of references for statistical data, figures, tables?
Is the article written in good English? Does it need the proofreading?
In your opinion, is the technical treatment plausible and free of technical errors?
In your opinion, are tables, graphs and illustrations clear enough?

Final recommendation of the reviewer:

☐ Paper accepted for publication without changes

■ **Paper accepted for publication after minor changes**

☐ Paper accepted for publication after major changes

☐ Paper rejected / Paper is not eligible for publication

Reviewer's Remarks only for the Editorial Board (optional)

This article is not original, it was previously published and I found it on the internet at ……..

Reviewer's Declaration

I agree to publish my name on the list of all reviewers at the journal's website according to the Polish law and the needs of the journal evaluation criteria.

Adam Johanson

Signature of the reviewer:

* * *

Please return it to the Editorial Board of EBER:
1) in the MS WORD electronic editable form for the author
2) as the PDF scanned (or printed-out) version with your signature for the archive purpose