

Reviewer Guidelines

Dear Reviewer,

We appreciate your commitment to reviewing the attached article submitted to "New Perspectives on Political Economy." Your insights are valuable in ensuring the quality and relevance of the content we publish. Please consider the following guidelines as you evaluate the manuscript:

Theoretical Part:

- Assess the literature review's depth and clarity.
- Evaluate the articulation of the problem, including the main aim, sub-aims, research questions, or hypotheses.
- Examine connections to existing research and justify the need for investigating the given issue.
- Identify the potential impacts of overlooking or inadequately addressing the examined phenomenon on science, practice, and policies.

Methodology:

- Evaluate the coherence between the theoretical and methodological sections.
- Assess the thought process behind choosing the research methods.
- Scrutinize the uniqueness and innovativeness of applied methods.
- Examine the sources and representativeness of the data used.
- Highlight the use of standard methods and the contribution of the research to the field.

Analysis and Results:

- Ensure continuity between the methodological and analytical sections.
- Evaluate the descriptive quality of the analytical process.
- Consider the need for detailed explanations of calculations, especially when using standard methods.
- Assess how results are interpreted and visualized.

Discussion:

- Evaluate the continuity between analytical and discussion sections.
- Assess the breadth of the discussion, connecting research findings with the theoretical framework.
- Validate universally applicable assumptions and evaluate the fulfilment of research objectives.
- Address any identified research limitations.

Conclusion:

- Evaluate the aptness of the conclusion in reflecting on findings.
- Assess the message and its relation to future research.
- Look for a concise summary of results and their implications.

References:

- Evaluate the structure, relevance, and topicality of the literature used.
- Assess the frequency of internet references and the share of cited reputable sources.
- Consider the number of citations from a single author.

Please submit your review electronically via the system or directly to the editorial board member within 3 weeks. We appreciate your time and dedication to maintaining the quality of New Perspectives on Political Economy.

Review form

Is the study's objective (goal, research questions) clearly stated?

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Rather disagree
- Disagree

Is there a literature review on previous works relevant to the paper's topic?

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Rather disagree
- Disagree

Is the paper methodologically valuable and methods are applied correctly?

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Rather disagree
- Disagree

Does the paper contain new knowledge?

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Rather disagree
- Disagree

Is the study's discussion section relevant and elaborate?

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Rather disagree
- Disagree

Type of research

- Scientific paper based on original research
- Review article, a critical review with value added
- Popular scientific paper not based on original research
- Other

Clarity and relevance of the study's title

- Yes, appropriate title
- No, title could use a change

Coherence and flow of the manuscript

- At a highest level
- At a high level
- Average or below average level

Clarity of language and expression, proper use of grammar and punctuation

- At the highest level
- At a high level
- Average or below average level

Clarity of visual elements

- Yes
- No
- Not applicable

Proper work with quotations,
the citation style.

paraphrases and following

- At a highest level
- At a high level
- Average or below average level

Recommendations for acceptance, overall impression, quality and contribution to the field

- Excellent paper - accept
- Recommended for publishing - Minor revisions are necessary
- Can be recommended for publishing - Major revisions are necessary
- Not recommended for publishing - Not even after major revision

Further comments and clear and detailed feedback to the author

Potential competing interests

- No competing interests
- Financial, personal, or professional affiliations that could be perceived as having biased the review process

A note to the editor