

GUIDELINES FOR REVIEWERS

Please receive the special thanks of the editorial board for your contribution to the progress and success of the *Management & Marketing* journal.

1. Purpose of peer review

Peer review, as a key element of scientific publishing, serves two purposes:

- filtering the research, to ensure it deserves being published;
- improving research quality, by highlighting key points and correcting errors.

2. Responsibility of the reviewer

When you are asked to review a material, please reflect on:

- whether the article matches your expertise, and accept only *if you are competent in the field*;
- whether you have the time needed to review the paper properly, *inside the announced deadline*; if not, *please inform the editor promptly and, if possible, recommend other potential reviewers*;

3. Writing the review

You are invited to write the review paying attention to the following aspects:

- *Originality*. Is the article innovative enough in its respective field of research? Does it add to the canon of knowledge? Is the research question an important one? Is the article in the top 25% papers in its field?
- *Structure*. Is the article clearly laid out, including all the key parts (abstract, key words, introduction, methodology, results, and conclusions)?
 - i. Does the *title* clearly describe the article?
 - ii. Does the *abstract* clearly reflect the content of the article?
 - iii. Does the *introduction* clearly state the problem which is investigated, and what the author wants to achieve? Does it state the hypothesis(es) and summarize previous literature?
 - iv. Does the *methodology* provide sufficient information as to make the research replicable? Is the design suitable for the problem investigated? Is there enough emphasis on data collection? Is the sampling appropriate? Are the new methods, if any, accurately explained?
 - v. Are the *results* logically presented? Are statistics correct? Are analyses appropriate?
 - vi. Do claims in the *conclusions* seem reasonable, and supported by results? Do authors relate to initial hypotheses and to previous research? Does the paper support or contradict older theories? Do conclusions explain how does the article contribute to knowledge advancement?

vii. Is the *language* accurate and well mastered? Do *illustrations* in the paper clearly inform the reader, and are they consistent with the story?

- *Previous research.* Does the article properly refer to previous research? Are there key references missing? Are the references accurate?
- *Ethical issues.* Do you suspect *plagiarism, fraud*, or issues concerning the confidentiality of the research, in case it involves human subjects? Please inform the editor.

4. Communicating the review to the editor

Your final report should address the points enumerated in the previous section. Your commentary should be courteous and constructive, providing insight into deficiencies, with detailed explanations.

Please refer to the following format:

Journal Name	Management & Marketing
Reviewer Reference	
Paper Title	
Review Due	

	Please rate the following: (5 excellent, 1 poor)	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
1	Originality						
2	Structure of the paper						
3	Standard of English						
4	Previous research						
5	Ethical issues						

Specific reviewer comments to be passed to the author/s. *Please expand on any weak areas in the checklist and offer specific advice as to how the author(s) may improve the paper.*

Should this paper be accepted for publication in *Management & Marketing*?

Yes - no changes		Yes - with minor revisions		Yes - with major revisions		No	
------------------	--	----------------------------	--	----------------------------	--	----	--