**Poznań University of Economics and Business Press**

**Monograph 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**

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

*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. **Genre- and content-related criteria**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Justifiability of the research, accuracy of problem formulation, originality and value of the (hypo)theses (position within the literature, potential impact on the development of academic research)   |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | very high | high | satisfactory | unsatisfactory | none |   *Comments:* |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2. Consistency with the current state of research and (if applicable) with the current legal context   |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | very high | high | satisfactory | unsatisfactory | none |   *Comments:* |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3. Research method(s): correctness of presentation and application; correctness of terminology and definitions; accuracy of references selection   |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | very high | high | satisfactory | unsatisfactory | none |   *Comments:* |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 4. Correctness of thesis verification and conclusions, correctness of the results   |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | very high | high | satisfactory | unsatisfactory | none |   *Comments:* |

1. **Formal and linguistic criteria**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Consistency between the title of the publication, the titles of its parts, chapters and sub-chapters and the work’s purposes and content   |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | very high | high | satisfactory | unsatisfactory | none |   *Comments:* |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2. Text structure: compositional correctness, suitable length, completeness, proportionality of individual chapters, avoidance of unnecessary repetition   |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | very good | good | satisfactory | unsatisfactory | none |   *Comments:* |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3. Formal correctness of references and footnotes (including the identification of citations)   |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | very high | high | satisfactory | unsatisfactory | none |   *Comments:* |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 4. Linguistic correctness: style (including the avoidance of jargon), clarity of argument, language adequacy for the type of publication, terminological correctness and consistency   |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | very high | high | satisfactory | unsatisfactory | none |   *Comments:* |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 5. Illustrative material: complete sets of tables, charts, maps and photos; its functionality in relation to the text; correctness of its description; its content-related and terminological consistency with the text   |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | very high | high | satisfactory | unsatisfactory | none |   *Comments:* |

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