

INSTRUCTIONS FOR REVIEWERS

Introduction:

All submissions to the Journal are subjected to a rigorous refereeing procedure which is crucial in maintaining high standards of scientific quality. Unbiased consideration should be given to all manuscripts offered for publication regardless of race, gender, sexual orientation, ethnic origin, and citizenship or religious or political beliefs of the author(s) (or any other possible discrimination factor).

Details about our reviewers are kept on an internal database. The information supplied by them is strictly confidential and is strictly designed to support the editorial process.

We are very grateful for the advice we receive from our referees and would be pleased to hear your comments on our procedures.

General Procedure:

The reviewers will receive relevant papers in their area of expertise. The outcome of the review process will be both a synthetic evaluation of the quality of paper as well as a set of recommendations for the author(s). The final decision will be based on the averaged evaluation of all reviewers.

If you wish to add confidential remarks for the editor, then please put these on a separate sheet. The reviewers' identities remain anonymous to authors. Thus, we will kindly ask that you do not transmit your report directly to the authors.

Reviewers are not expected to make corrections to the English in a paper. However, it will be usefully if you can suggest to the author(s) corrections where the meaning is unclear.

Reviewers are asked to consider whether the content of an article is of sufficient interest to justify its length. If you recommend shortening it is useful to the author(s) if you can indicate specific areas where you think that shortening is required.

Reviewers' reports can be sent back to the Editorial Office by e-mail to jhec@feaa.uvt.ro

Reviewers are asked to complete a score-sheet form. The first section of this deals with the scientific quality and technical contributions of the papers. It is extremely important to accurately evaluate the degree of novelty as well as the soundness of these contributions. Further, the reviewers are asked to make a publishing recommendation (Accept as it is /Accept subject to minor amendments /Accept subject to substantial changes/ Reject) on this basis and finally to supply detailed comments to both the Editors and Author.

Accordingly to the averaged score from all five evaluations: (a) the paper may be accepted, (b) the reviewers' reports may be sent to the authors for amendments or revision, (c) the paper may be rejected, or (d), if the paper contains too many errors for the reviewers to comment fully on the content, the authors will be asked to make the necessary corrections and then resubmit the article. In order to be accepted, the average score should be at least 35 (from a maximum of 40).

Revised Papers:

When authors make revisions to their article in response to the reviewers' comments they are asked to submit a list of changes and any clarifications to the received comments and critics. The revised version is then returned to the original reviewers who are asked whether the revisions have been carried out satisfactorily. A new score-sheet will be completed and sent back to the Editorial Office.

Key Points:

It will be of great help to the author(s) and the Editors if you could pay attention to a number of key points in your assessment:

Quality of the paper:

- Does the paper represent a substantial contribution to the existing literature?
- Are the research hypotheses falsifiable (in Popper's sense) or they are merely conjectures?
- Is the critical part of the paper well-articulated?
- Does the paper address a relevant issue?
- Is the paper based on a sound methodology?
- Are there suggested further research directions?
- Are there highlighted the main policy implications of the findings?

Technical elements:

- Is the title adequate / appropriate?
- Does the abstract contain the essential information of the article?
- Are the figures, graphics, tables clearly presented and are these relevant?
- Are significant parts of the manuscript already been published? Serial publications are not encouraged and a follow-up paper must contain significant additional material to that already published.