**Poznań University of Economics and Business Press**

**Textbook 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” tab or contact the PUEB Press.

**Peer review**

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Justifiability of writing the textbook, relevance of its thematic scope (compared to other published textbooks)  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | very high | high | satisfactory | unsatisfactory | none |   *Comments:* |

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3. Correctness of the teaching forms (lecture, case study, boxes, tables, figures, questions, tasks, etc.); accuracy of references selection   |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | very high | high | satisfactory | unsatisfactory | none |   *Comments:* |

**II. Formal and linguistic criteria**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Consistency between the title of the publication, the titles of its parts, chapters and sub-chapters and the 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 accuracy 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:* |

**III. Potential readers and possible non-educational application**

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Potential readers (field of study, specialisation, level of study, practitioners, other) |

|  |
| --- |
| 2. Potential non-educational applications |

**IV. Other comments**

|  |
| --- |
|  |

**V. Conclusion**

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

………………………………………………

Date and signature