**Poznań University of Economics and Business Press**

**Edited book review form**

*Dear Reviewer*,

We attach great importance to the high quality of our publications and the ethical standards of our publishing activity. Consequently, at the review stage, we need an informed, independent, objective and confidential opinion on the book submitted. Please prepare a possibly concise, yet in-depth, peer review containing an unambiguous conclusion and specific requests/suggestions for changes. To facilitate and standardise the reviewing process, we have produced the form below.

Should you have any doubts concerning the ethical aspects of the authorship of the book under review or of the whole process, please read about our procedures and ethical principles at <https://wydawnictwo.ue.poznan.pl/en/main_page.html> in the “For Authors” section or contact the PUEB Press.

**Peer review**

*Scientific editor ..…………………….……………………………………………………………………………………………*

*Title ……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………..*

REVIEWER’S DECLARATION CONCERNING A POTENTIAL CONFLICT OF INTERESTS IN HIS/HER RELATIONSHIP WITH THE AUTHOR/CO-AUTHOR/SCIENTIFIC EDITOR OF THE BOOK UNDER REVIEW

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **No conflict of interests such as**  |  |  |
| 1. | Being employed in the same institution as the author (currently or in the last five years) | yes | no |
| 2.  | Co-authorship of an scientific text with the author in the last five years | yes | no |
| 3. | Mentor-mentee, superior-subordinate relationship with the author | yes | no |
| 4. | Close professional cooperation, participation in the same grant with the author | yes | no |
| 5. | Personal, political, religious or other motives jeopardising the independence of the reviewer’s opinion | yes | no |
| 6. | Other | yes | no |

……………………........

Date and signature

1. **Overall evaluation of the edited book**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Relevance and clarity of the concept of the collection (Does the edited book fill a research gap? Are its goals consistent? Does the title correspond to the content? Does the book contain an introduction in which its scientific editor formulates the goals of the publication, justifies its concept and shows its structure?)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| very high | high | satisfactory | unsatisfactory | none |

*Comments:* |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2. Relevance of chapters to the concept of the collection (Are they closely related to the subject? Are they complementary? Do they cover a significant part of the subject?)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| very high | high | satisfactory | unsatisfactory | none |

*Comments:* |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3. Correctness of the composition (Are the structure of the edited book and the order of chapters correct? Do they result from the concept of the book?)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| very high | high | satisfactory | unsatisfactory | none |

*Comments:* |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 4. Correctness of scientific editing (research consistency, including methodological and terminological consistency, avoidance of unnecessary repetition; Is there a summary with general conclusions resulting from the book as a whole?)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| very high | high | satisfactory | unsatisfactory | none |

*Comments:* |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 5. Editorial uniformity (similar length of individual chapters; uniformity of their structure; uniformity of references and footnotes; if applicable, stylistic uniformity)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| very high | high | satisfactory | unsatisfactory | none |

*Comments:* |

1. **Evaluation of individual chapters**

*(Please copy the table below for each chapter and assess each chapter separately. Provide the title of the chapter assessed)*

*Author(s) ……………………………….……………….……………………………………………………………………………………………*

*Title …………………………………………………....……………………………………………………………………………………………..*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| No. | Criteria | Evaluation | Option selected |
| 1. | Consistency between the chapter’s topic and the concept of the edited book | yes |  |
| no |  |
| partial |  |
| 2. | Contribution to the development of scientific research | major |  |
| minor |  |
| none |  |
| 3. | Research method (correctness of presentation and application, terminology and definitions, references selection, illustrations, conclusions and research results) | high |  |
| satisfactory |  |
| unsatisfactory |  |
| 4. | Linguistic correctness, adequacy of titles, discipline and clarity of argument  | high |  |
| satisfactory |  |
| unsatisfactory |  |
| 5. | Formal correctness of references and footnotes (including the identification of citations) | high |  |
| satisfactory |  |
| unsatisfactory |  |
| 6. | Descriptive evaluation |

1. **Potential readers and the significance of the book**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Potential readers

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| researchers | students and young researchers | practitioners | decision-makers | other |

*Comments:* |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2. Potential applications

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| inspiration for further research  | education | business practice | political and social life | other |

*Comments:* |

1. **Other comments**

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. **Conclusion**
2. The book is ready to publish in the form submitted.
3. The book is ready to publish on the condition that it has been corrected according to the reviewer's instructions.
4. The book is ready to publish on the condition that it has been corrected and that the new version has been approved by the reviewer.
5. A thoroughly corrected version of the book should be re-reviewed.
6. The book is not suitable for publication.

………………………………………………

 Date and signature