

Instructions for Reviewers

January 1st, 2016

Peer review is designed to assess the validity, quality and the originality of articles to be published in the CEJPP. Its ultimate purpose is to maintain the integrity of science by filtering out invalid or poor quality articles. Peer review not only helps the editor choose whether to accept or reject the paper. It also helps the author improve the overall quality of their manuscript, even if the decision is to reject the article. Always consider if your comments could be used to improve the work.

The reviewers shall be experts in the given field and, if possible, they should not be institutionally or personally associated with the author. The reviewers shall have four weeks to produce a review, and be notified about the expiry of this period. Unless they forward their assessments within one week following this period, a fresh reviewer shall be appointed. The review is not financially rewarded.

We recommend to structure the review in three sections: summary, major issues, minor issues.

- 1) **Summary** – briefly summarize what the paper is about and what the findings are (context, significance and overall quality of the paper)
- 2) **Major issues** – state if there are major issues and what the severity of their impact is on the paper; if major revisions are required, try to indicate clearly what they are
- 3) **Minor Issues** – provide list of minor issues regarding ambiguity of meaning, citations, factual errors, labels etc. If relevant, suggest how can these be corrected.

Also, the following review questions may be useful:

- Is the title appropriate?
- Is the abstract complete and concise?
- Are the research problems and objectives well stated?
- Do the conclusions answer objectives? Are they warranted?
- Are the references present, germane, complete?
- Is clarity of expression and continuity sufficient?
- Is the writing concise? Are irrelevant aspects eliminated?
- Is the presentation complete?
- Is the scientific approach used?
- Are findings usable by other users/researchers?
- Is the work timely?
- Does it have fundamental value?
- Is the approach original or innovative?
- Will findings directly or indirectly benefit policy-making?