

Financial and Economic Review – Guidelines for Peer Reviewers

Dear Sir / Madam,

A request for peer reviewing an academic paper represents the recognition of the academic performance of the peer reviewer. Journals owe much of their reputation to their peer reviewers. It is therefore important to make sure that you only undertake the peer reviewing of papers close to your own area of expertise.

The journal Financial and Economic Review will only accept papers based on their author's own research and presenting new and novel results. Reviews and descriptions of the literature do not constitute a paper; they should serve as no more than its theoretical background. The literature used in the article should be relevant and the latest literature should also be included. The selected method of research should match the objective laid down. We believe that the self-serving use of econometrics is unnecessary. The data used should not be old. The study should have a clear, logical and consistent structure.

In writing your peer review, please give special consideration to the matters laid out below.

Plagiarism. A paper that contains sections fully or partly borrowed from other works without proper referencing is considered as plagiarism. Suspected plagiarism must be immediately reported to the editor-in-chief and the editor.

Confidentiality. Every manuscript sent out for peer review should be considered a confidential document. Manuscripts must not be issued to third parties without the approval of the editor-in-chief. The conclusions and results of the paper may be used prior to the peer review only with the author's written consent. The data and research results accessed during the peer review process classify as confidential data and must not be used by the peer reviewer in their own research. If the peer reviewer requires the involvement of a third party in the peer review process, they should notify this fact to the editor-in-chief in advance.

The peer reviewer will remain anonymous throughout the process. The author must not be made aware of the identity of the peer reviewer, and therefore name, position, easily identifiable office and earlier academic achievements should not be indicated in peer reviews. The peer reviewer must never contact the author directly.

Originality. The peer reviewer should assess whether the paper contains sufficiently new/novel results and whether it is suitable for publication. What degree of academic contribution does it represent? Does it meet the requirements demanded by the journal? Is the research question significant and sufficiently scholarly?

Structure

Layout and format. Our authors must comply with the Guidelines for Authors, which concern mostly the writing of the manuscript. If a paper fails to satisfy these requirements, the peer review may highlight this fact.

Title. Does it capture the subject matter discussed in the paper clearly and well?

Abstract. Does it represent the contents/message of the paper?

Introduction. It should be decided whether the author is sufficiently clear in presenting specifically what they wish to achieve with their essay and whether they identify accurately the problem they wish to explore. Essentially, the introductory section should review the relevant literature, locating the paper within a well-defined context. Here, the author may briefly review the results of other authors and indicate whether they wish to expand the theoretical framework or refute it. This section contains a description of the research to be carried out, the hypotheses and the general research methodologies and approaches.

Graphic representations and emphases. Charts and tables should be sufficiently informative for the readers and should match the main argument of the paper. Do the statistical data visualisation methods employed represent the data used well? Are the charts and tables, and the data visualisation methods used in them, consistent?

Methodology. Does the author present clearly how they arrived at the data? Is the methodology selected suitable to answer the research question? Are there sufficient quantities of data to duplicate the research? If the method is new, is it presented in a consistent and exhaustive manner? Was the sample selected properly?

Results. In this section, the author should describe the results and conclusions they arrived at through their research. It should be decided whether the analysis was conducted to the appropriate academic standard. Is the statistical approach satisfactory? Importantly, this is not the section where the results should be interpreted.

Conclusion and Discussion. The assertions in this section are predicated on the results. It is important for the assertions to be well-reasoned. Does the author indicate how the results relate to the expectations and to earlier research? Does the paper contradict or, rather, support the earlier theoretical approach? Is there mention of how the research will contribute to academic progress in the given field?

Language and style. If the paper contains a multitude of spelling and grammatical errors, these do not have to be corrected. The editor-in-chief should be notified, however.

Earlier research. If a paper relies on earlier research, it will be important to decide whether it represents the antecedents properly. Were certain important works omitted? Are the references appropriate?

In the light of the above, we ask our peer reviewers to underline the relevant text, if applicable, and then add their suggestions for changes to complete their peer review!

The novelty and importance of the subject matter:

Outstanding	Average	Modest
-------------	---------	--------

The practical relevance of the results:

Outstanding	Average	Modest
-------------	---------	--------

The length of the manuscript in relation to its academic content:

Suitable	Too short	Too long
----------	-----------	----------

The editing and the logical structure of the manuscript:

Outstanding	Acceptable	Confused
-------------	------------	----------

Evaluation of the title in relation to the content of the manuscript:

Clear and meaningful	Too long and detailed	Too generic, not meaningful
----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------------

The formulation of the objective(s):

Clear and logical	Partly clear	Not clear
-------------------	--------------	-----------

The quality of the methodology:

Outstanding	Satisfactory	Weak
-------------	--------------	------

The quality of the statistical processing of data:

Outstanding	Satisfactory	Weak
-------------	--------------	------

The communication of the results:

Clear	Partly clear	Incoherent, not clear
-------	--------------	-----------------------

Evaluation of the conclusions in relation to the objectives and the results:

Sound Partly supported Unfounded

Tables:

Self-explanatory Not self-explanatory

Sufficient in number Too few Too many

Charts and images:

Self-explanatory Not self-explanatory

Sufficient in number Too few Too many

References to literature:

Satisfactory Not satisfactory

The grammatical correctness of the text of the manuscript:

Outstanding Satisfactory Weak

Peer Review

(to review papers submitted to the Financial and Economic Review)

1. The title of the paper:

2. Summary opinion about the paper:

3. Conclusion – (peer reviewer’s decision underlined):

- a. I recommend it for publication – without any changes
- b. May be published – with minor corrections and additions (see Section 4 for the peer reviewer’s suggestions)
- c. Fundamental corrections and additions are needed (see Section 4 for the peer reviewer’s expectations)
- d. I do not recommend publishing this paper in the Financial and Economic Review
- e. I do not recommend publishing this paper among the peer reviewed articles in the Financial and Economic Review but I believe that it may be considered for publication in the essay/opinion column

4. The peer reviewer’s suggestions for corrections and additions in the paper:

- a) suggestions for corrections and additions in the paper:

- b) the peer reviewer’s expectations for significantly reworking the paper/supplying missing sections:

- c) formal corrections and additions: language use, clarifications in charts, diagrams and tables, corrections in bibliography