

## REVIEWING FORM

### 1Non-Conflict of Interest Statement:

I, .....[Reviewer's Full Name],  
declare that I have no conflicts of interest related to the evaluation and review of the manuscript titled; .....  
.....'[Title of the Manuscript]' submitted to *Journal of Applied Economic Sciences*.

I affirm that I do not have any financial, professional, or personal affiliations or relationships with any individual, organization, or entity that could potentially influence or bias my judgment or review of the manuscript. I have no direct or indirect competing interests, including financial, commercial, or any other relationships that could be perceived as creating a conflict of interest in the context of this review process.

I am committed to providing an unbiased and objective evaluation of the manuscript based solely on its scientific merits, originality, validity, and relevance to the field. I will maintain strict confidentiality and handle all materials and information provided for the review process with the utmost professionalism and integrity.

If any conflicts of interest arise during the course of the review process, I will promptly disclose them to the Editor-in-Chief or the handling editor of *Journal of Applied Economic Sciences*.

Reviewer's Full Name,  
.....

Reviewer's Affiliation,  
.....

Signature: .....

Date: .....

### Form for Reviewers

Please evaluate the articles submitted to our journal as follows:

1. Written evaluation – critics and comments on the article (ten lines - max 1 page)
2. Evaluation based on the form.

Paper: .....

#### Evaluation form

No.	Criteria	Evaluation 1-10points
1.	The title is clear and reflects the object of study	
2.	The abstract synthesizes well the content of the article	
3.	The introduction clearly outlines 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.	
4.	The article contains a good overview on the previous studies from the same domain. <u>Comments:</u>	
5.	The methodology in use is coherently presented and there is a fair justification of it being preferred instead of other existent methodologies. Does the paper feature a separate subchapter devoted to the description of the methodology? <u>Comments:</u>	

<sup>1</sup> This part is available only for Editor in Chief

6.	The source of the database is reliable (official databases, representative samples, etc)	
7.	The scientific contribution of the paper is original for the economic theory or practice. <u>Comments:</u>	
8.	The conclusions summarize clearly the results and the consequences	
9.	Recent and well chosen (suitable) bibliography. There is a clear match between the bibliographic references from the end of the article and the ones quoted in the text.	
10.	The vocabulary used is academic, without incoherencies or grammar mistakes.	

Overall rating of the paper

Rating this paper in comparison to similar papers published in the field in top-rated scientific journals:

- A. Unacceptable
- B. Below Average
- C. Average
- D. Above Average
- E. Top

My rating is: .....

The recommendation for publication:

- A. Accepted in the initial form
- B. Accepted with minor modifications
- C. Recommend re-submit after substantial modifications
- D. Rejected

My recommendation is: .....

Comments: You should write your comments on your paper: