

**ARTICLE REVIEW
SCIENTIFIC CRITERIA**

Title Manuscript		
REVIEW CRITERIA	QUESTIONS	Rating (Underline the rating)
1. PRESENTATION Positive responses for these questions represent high presentation ratings. Negative responses for these questions represent low presentation ratings.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the article have a logic structure? • Is the article clearly written? • Is the article correctly written (from the grammar point of view)? • Does the article present in an appropriate way, the terminology for its area of interest? 	<p>poor</p> <p>needs improvements</p> <p>average</p> <p>good</p> <p>excellent</p>
2. CONTENT: In this section, there are ten elements to be evaluated. These are presented below. Positive		
2.1. Title	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the title clearly express the content of the article? 	<p>poor</p> <p>needs improvements</p> <p>average good</p> <p>excellent</p>
2.2. Abstract	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the abstract sufficiently informative? • Does the abstract describe the research and the results? 	<p>poor</p> <p>needs improvements</p> <p>average good</p> <p>excellent</p>
2.3. Introduction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the introduction correctly highlight the current concerns in the area ? • Does the introduction specify the research objectives? 	<p>poor</p> <p>needs improvements</p> <p>average good</p> <p>excellent</p>
2.4 Methodology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are the methods used clearly explained? • Are the methods used validated / recognized? • Are the data and statistics used reliable? 	<p>poor</p> <p>needs improvements</p> <p>average good</p> <p>excellent</p>
2.5 Results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are the results clearly presented? • Do the results sufficiently avoid misinterpretation? • Do the results sufficiently avoid assumptions and speculations? 	<p>poor</p> <p>needs improvements</p> <p>average good</p> <p>excellent</p>
2.6. Discussion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are all relevant connections with others work/ research declared? • Is the literature used in support of research ufficiently comprehensive and current? • Do the discussion sufficiently avoid too general or biased information? 	<p>poor</p> <p>needs improvements</p> <p>average good</p> <p>excellent</p>
2.7. Conclusions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are the conclusions correctly / logically explained? • Do the conclusions sufficiently avoid misinterpretation? 	<p>poor</p> <p>needs improvements</p> <p>average good excellent</p>
2.8. Bibliography	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do the bibliography reflect the latest Work / research in the considered area? • Are the references properly indexed and recorded in the bibliography? 	<p>poor</p> <p>needs improvements</p> <p>average good</p> <p>excellent</p>
2.8 Tables	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do the tables correctly indicate the measuring units and the source? 	<p>poor</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are the tables correctly named and numbered? • Are the data presented in tables correctly valued and interpreted in the article? • Are the tables well proportioned and aesthetically placed in the article? 	needs improvements average good excellent
2.9. Graphs and figures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do the graphs and figures properly illustrate the discussed subject? • Do the graphs and figures correctly indicate the measuring units and the source? • Are the graphs and figures correctly named and numbered? • Are the data presented in graphs and figures correctly valued and interpreted in the article? • Are the graphs and figures well proportioned and aesthetically placed in the article? 	poor needs improvements average good excellent
2.10. PLAGIARISM	• If an article (or parts from an article) is suspected to be a substantial copy of an earlier work, the article is rejected.	Accepted Rejected

3. FINAL DECISION

OVERALL RATING (Underline the rating)	FINAL RATING (Underline the rating)
Poor	Rejected (not in compliance with the line of the Review of Economic and Business Studies)
Needs improvements	To be Revised and resubmitted
Average	To be Revised and resubmitted
Good	Accepted with minimum changes
Excellent	Accepted

4. COMMENTS FOR THE AUTHOR :

(Name of Reviewer)