

## **REVIEWER GUIDELINES FOR JOURNAL OF MANGEMENT AND ECONOMICS (JME)**

JME understands the importance of an effective peer review when authors submit their research. JME works to establish and sustain peer review integrity itself. A vital part of this means ensuring that reviewers have the right resources to carry out their work efficiently and effectively. Hence, reviewers should provide a constructive, comprehensive, evidenced, and appropriately substantial peer review report.

### **The process of peer review of JME as follows;**

- ❖ The journal receives a paper.
- ❖ The journal editor checks the paper against the journal's aims and scope.
- ❖ The editor then selects reviewers (usually 2 peers) and sends the paper.
- ❖ The reviewers read the paper and provide comments, suggestions and a recommendation (reject, revise or accept).
- ❖ The editor checks the reviews and sends them to the author(s), with any extra guidance. If there are revisions, the author(s) decides whether to make these and re-submit.
- ❖ Authors make amendments and re-submit the paper.
- ❖ If the journal accepts the paper, it moves into production and is published.

### **Before agreeing to review for a journal, consider the following:**

- ❖ The form of review the journal operates
- ❖ Aware of the ethical guidelines for reviewers
- ❖ Make the editor aware immediately if you have any conflict of interest.
- ❖ Complete the review in the allotted time. If you struggle to meet the deadline, let the editor know, so they can inform the author.

## Writing review reports: a step-by-step guide are given below;

### Step 1. Research the journal

Visit the journal homepage ([jme@seu.ac.lk](mailto:jme@seu.ac.lk)) to get a sense of the journal's content and house style. This will help you decide whether the paper you're reviewing is suitable for the journal or not. Refer to the Instructions for Authors to check if the paper meets the submission criteria of the journal (e.g. length, scope, and other instructions).

### Step 2. Write your review report

The two main factors you should provide advice on are:

- ❖ the originality, presentation, and relevance of the manuscript's subject matter to the readership of the journal
- ❖ the **accuracy of the methodology**.

### Step 3. Provide detailed comments

- ❖ These should be suitable for sending to the author. Use these comments to make constructive suggestions, seek clarification on any unclear points, and ask for further elaboration.
- ❖ Make suggestions on how the author can improve clarity, succinctness, and the quality of presentation.
- ❖ Confirm whether you feel the subject of the paper is sufficiently interesting to justify its length. If you recommend shortening, show specific areas where you think it's required.
- ❖ It's not the reviewer's job to edit the paper for language, but it is helpful if you correct the language where the technical meaning is unclear.
- ❖ A referee may disagree with the author's opinions, but should allow them to stand, provided their evidence supports it.
- ❖ Remember that authors will welcome positive feedback as well as constructive criticism.
- ❖ Comments should be carefully worded so the author understands what actions they need to take to improve their paper. Avoid generalized or vague statements as well as any negative comments which aren't relevant or constructive.

### Step 4. Make a recommendation

Once you've read the paper and have assessed its quality, you need to make a recommendation to the editor about publication. the key decisions are:

- ❖ **Accept.** The paper is suitable for publication in its current form.

- ❖ **Minor revision.** The paper will be ready for publication after light revisions. Please list the revisions you would recommend the author makes.
- ❖ **Major revision.** The paper needs substantial changes such as expanded data analysis, widening of the literature review, or rewriting sections of the text.
- ❖ **Reject.** The paper isn't suitable for publication with this journal, or the revisions are too fundamental for the submission to continue being considered in its current form.

## Revisions

When authors make revisions to their article, they're asked to submit a list of changes and any comments for the reviewers. The revised version is usually returned to the original reviewer if possible. The reviewer is then asked to affirm whether the revisions are satisfactory.

## Ethical guidelines for peer reviewers

All peer reviewers must follow these ethical guidelines for JME articles in review:

- ❖ Reviewers must give unbiased consideration to each manuscript submitted. They should judge each on its merits, without regard to race, religion, nationality, sex, seniority, or institutional affiliation of the author(s).
- ❖ Reviewers must declare any conflict of interest before agreeing to review a manuscript. This includes any relationship with the author that may bias their review.
- ❖ Reviewers must keep the peer review process confidential. They must not share information or correspondence about a manuscript with anyone outside of the peer review process.
- ❖ Reviewers should provide a constructive, comprehensive, evidenced, and appropriately substantial peer review report.
- ❖ Reviewers must avoid making statements in their report which might be construed as impugning any person's reputation.
- ❖ Reviewers should make all reasonable effort to submit their report and recommendation on time. They should inform the editor if this is not possible.
- ❖ Reviewers should call to the journal editor's attention any significant similarity between the manuscript under consideration and any published paper or submitted manuscripts of which they are aware.

## Reviewer recognition

Reviewers invest a huge amount of time and expertise in the peer review process. It's crucial that they feel supported and recognized in their role. Hence, **Reviewer certificate** will be given for their recognition in order to serve as a formal acknowledgment of a reviewer's role in the peer review process of a journal. Reviewers can request the certificate from the Chief Editor of JME. A reviewer confirmation letter is also available upon request