



Title of the paper:

Criteria	Unacceptable		Below average		Average		Good		Very Good	
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Originality of the paper										
Quality of the language										
Relationship between the content and the title of the paper										
Presentation of current theories in the field										
Empirical contribution										
Quality of the methods applied										

Formal criteria for scientific papers	Yes	Partially: it should be improved	No
Does the abstract outline the background, objectives, methodology, data, results, and main contribution of the paper?			
Does the introduction clearly outline the aim and motivation for writing the paper? It should provide a context for the discussion in the body of the paper and theoretical/empirical research gap.			
Does the literature review have a logical form? Does it present strong theoretical background for the empirical research and its methodology?			
Does the paper feature a separate subchapter devoted to the description of the methodology?			
Are the results presented and commented in sufficient details with sound reasoning and appropriate interpretation ?			
Are the findings in the discussion section critically assessed and compared to findings of other authors?			
Does the conclusion provide a neat summary of the main results, provide implications and recommendation for practice, description of limitations and suggestions for future research?			
Is the bibliography appropriate and up-to-date?			

Overall rating of the paper	Unacceptable Bottom 20%	Below Average	Average	Above Average	Top 20%
Rating of this paper in comparison to similar papers published in top-rated scientific journals					

Formal editorial quality of the paper	Yes	Partially: it should be improved	No
Does the structure of the article meet the requirements?			
Are the tables and charts adjusted to the requirements?			
Are the References adjusted to the DOI requirements?			
Are the References adjusted to the Harvard norms – APA styles (American Psychological Association 6th edition)			

Evaluation: 0-3 the paper cannot be published; 4-5 the paper can be published once the corrections suggested by the Reviewer are introduced under condition of additional review; 6-7 the paper can be published once the corrections suggested by the Reviewer are introduced; 8-9 unconditional recommendation for publishing the paper

Note to Reviewer:

The referee should especially comment on the criteria which are rated as unacceptable or below average. Comments for the authors should refer to text fragment (in the form of a citation or a reference to paragraph or page number).



Comments of the Reviewer:

Conclusion:

I recommend publishing the article in the current form (accept).	
I recommend publishing the article after corrections (minor revision).	
I recommend considering the article for further processing, under the condition of additional review after corrections (major revision).	
I recommend rejecting the article.	

Note to Reviewer:

The referee should especially comment on the criteria which are rated as unacceptable or below average. Comments for the authors should refer to text fragment (in the form of a citation or a reference to paragraph or page number).