

## ARTICLE REVIEW

### THE REVIEW PROCESS (FOR ALL THOSE INVOLVED IN THE REVIEW PROCESS)

The review process needs to be standardized in order to obtain comparable results.

The review research is structured in two steps:

**1. The formal review** – this step is focused on the article's form. The formal review is conducted by the editorial secretary that checks for:

- respecting the registration terms;
- respecting the limit of length of article;
- respecting the design and formal guidelines of REBS.

The editorial team evaluates the current form of an article and makes suggestions concerning potential modifications:

- articles will not be rejected upon formal deficiencies. The article can be rejected only if it doesn't respect de registration terms;
- annotations are understood to aid in making submitted and accepted articles consistent with the design and formal guidelines of REBS.

**2. The scientific review** – this step is focused on the article's content. The scientific review is realized by the reviewers committee, formed by specialists in the area of research where the article fits.

All reviewers must base their judgement on the same interpretation of the review criteria. This is the reason for which we define and explain the review criteria: Originality, Significance, Relevance, Presentation, Content, and Plagiarism. In order to evaluate each criteria, reviewers must respond to several questions.

For each criteria, reviewers use a unified rating scale divided into five units. The units are expressed by adjective like "poor", "average" or "excellent". The first unit represents the lowest, the last unit the highest, and the middle unit an average rating.

For each article, reviewers must complete a review form with the evaluation for the criteria indicated above. In the end of the review form, the reviewer can make comments. These comments have to be constructive and friendly. The comments can not include any personal remarks to the author.

After completing the review form, the reviewer has to send it to the editorial secretary. They are responsible to inform the author about the final decision and to send him the complete review form.

**ARTICLE REVIEW**

**- FORMAL CRITERIA -**

**I. GENERAL INFORMATION**

Article No. ....

Article Type.....

Article Title.....

.....

Article Author (s) .....

.....

Authors Affiliation .....

.....

Assigned Reviewer .....

Date .....

**A. FORMAL CRITERIA**

<b>FORMAL CRITERIA</b>	<b>SCALE</b>	<b>DECISION</b>
<b>Registration date</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Respects the registration date <input type="checkbox"/> Does not respect the registration date	<input type="checkbox"/> Accepted <input type="checkbox"/> Rejected
<b>Length of article</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Respects the limit of length of article <input type="checkbox"/> Does not respect the limit of length of article	<input type="checkbox"/> Accepted <input type="checkbox"/> Accepted with minimum changes <input type="checkbox"/> To be Revised and resubmitted
<b>Design and formal aspect</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> poor <input type="checkbox"/> needs improvements <input type="checkbox"/> average <input type="checkbox"/> good <input type="checkbox"/> excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Accepted <input type="checkbox"/> Accepted with minimum changes <input type="checkbox"/> To be Revised and resubmitted

## ARTICLE REVIEW

### - SCIENTIFIC CRITERIA -

#### I. GENERAL INFORMATION

Article No. ....

Article Type.....

Article Title.....

Assigned Reviewer .....

Date .....

#### II. SCIENTIFIC CRITERIA

REVIEW CRITERIA	QUESTIONS	SCALE
<p><b>I. ORIGINALITY</b> Positive responses for these questions represent high originality ratings. Negative responses for these questions represent low originality ratings.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are the problems discussed in the article new?</li> <li>• Does the article point out differences from related research?</li> <li>• Does the article describe an innovative combination of techniques from different disciplines?</li> <li>• Does the article introduce an idea that appears promising or might stimulate others to develop promising alternatives?</li> </ul>	<input type="checkbox"/> poor <input type="checkbox"/> needs improvements <input type="checkbox"/> average <input type="checkbox"/> good <input type="checkbox"/> excellent
<p><b>II. SIGNIFICANCE</b> Positive responses for these questions represent high significance ratings. Negative responses for these questions represent low significance ratings.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the article have a considerable contribution to a certain area of research?</li> <li>• Does the article stimulate discussion of important issues or alternative points of view?</li> </ul>	<input type="checkbox"/> poor <input type="checkbox"/> needs improvements <input type="checkbox"/> average <input type="checkbox"/> good <input type="checkbox"/> excellent
<p><b>III. RELEVANCE</b> Positive responses for these questions represent high</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the article fit in REBS's area of research?</li> <li>• Is the article relevant to REBS's objectives?</li> <li>• Does the article present relevant information</li> </ul>	<input type="checkbox"/> poor <input type="checkbox"/> needs improvements <input type="checkbox"/> average

relevance ratings. Negative responses for these questions represent low relevance ratings.	for its area of research?	<input type="checkbox"/> good <input type="checkbox"/> excellent
<b>IV. PRESENTATION</b> Positive responses for these questions represent high presentation ratings. Negative responses for these questions represent low presentation ratings.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the article have a logic structure?</li> <li>• Is the article clearly written?</li> <li>• Is the article correctly written (from the grammar point of view)?</li> <li>• Does the article present in an appropriate way the terminology for its area of interest?</li> </ul>	<input type="checkbox"/> poor <input type="checkbox"/> needs improvements <input type="checkbox"/> average <input type="checkbox"/> good <input type="checkbox"/> excellent
<b>V. CONTENT</b> In this section, there are nine elements to be evaluated. These are presented below. Positive responses for these questions represent high content ratings. Negative responses for these questions represent low content ratings.		<input type="checkbox"/> poor <input type="checkbox"/> needs improvements <input type="checkbox"/> average <input type="checkbox"/> good <input type="checkbox"/> excellent
<b>5.1. Title</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the title clearly express the content of the article?</li> <li>• Is the title suggestive for the theme proposed by REBS (if there is a proposed theme)?</li> </ul>	<input type="checkbox"/> poor <input type="checkbox"/> needs improvements <input type="checkbox"/> average <input type="checkbox"/> good <input type="checkbox"/> excellent
<b>5.2 Abstract</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the abstract sufficiently informative?</li> <li>• Does the abstract describe the research and the results?</li> <li>• Does the abstract provide a good perspective on the final message of the article?</li> </ul>	<input type="checkbox"/> poor <input type="checkbox"/> needs improvements <input type="checkbox"/> average <input type="checkbox"/> good <input type="checkbox"/> excellent
<b>5.3 Introduction</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the introduction correctly highlight the current concerns in the area?</li> <li>• Does the introduction specify the research objectives?</li> <li>• Does the introduction present the article contribution to economic theory and/or practice improvements?</li> </ul>	<input type="checkbox"/> poor <input type="checkbox"/> needs improvements <input type="checkbox"/> average <input type="checkbox"/> good <input type="checkbox"/> excellent
<b>5.4 Methodology</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are the methods used clearly explained?</li> <li>• Are the methods used validated / recognized?</li> <li>• Are the data and statistics used reliable?</li> </ul>	<input type="checkbox"/> poor <input type="checkbox"/> needs improvements <input type="checkbox"/> average <input type="checkbox"/> good <input type="checkbox"/> excellent

<b>5.5 Results</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are the results clearly presented?</li> <li>• Are all relevant connections with others' work/research declared?</li> <li>• Is the literature used in support of research sufficiently comprehensive and current?</li> <li>• Do the results sufficiently avoid misinterpretation?</li> <li>• Do the results sufficiently avoid assumptions and speculations?</li> </ul>	<input type="checkbox"/> poor <input type="checkbox"/> needs improvements <input type="checkbox"/> average <input type="checkbox"/> good <input type="checkbox"/> excellent
<b>5.6 Conclusions</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are the conclusions correctly / logically explained?</li> <li>• Do the conclusions sufficiently avoid misinterpretation?</li> <li>• Do the conclusions sufficiently avoid too general or biased information?</li> </ul>	<input type="checkbox"/> poor <input type="checkbox"/> needs improvements <input type="checkbox"/> average <input type="checkbox"/> good <input type="checkbox"/> excellent
<b>5.7 References</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Do the references reflect the latest work/research in the considered area??</li> <li>• Are the references correctly indicated in the article?</li> <li>• Are the references properly indexed and recorded in the bibliography?</li> </ul>	<input type="checkbox"/> poor <input type="checkbox"/> needs improvements <input type="checkbox"/> average <input type="checkbox"/> good <input type="checkbox"/> excellent
<b>5.8 Tables</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Do the tables correctly indicate the measuring units and the source?</li> <li>• Are the tables correctly named and numbered?</li> <li>• Are the data presented in tables correctly valued and interpreted in the article?</li> <li>• Are the tables well proportioned and aesthetically placed in the article?</li> </ul>	<input type="checkbox"/> poor <input type="checkbox"/> needs improvements <input type="checkbox"/> average <input type="checkbox"/> good <input type="checkbox"/> excellent
<b>5.9 Graphs and figures</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Do the graphs and figures properly illustrate the discussed subject?</li> <li>• Do the graphs and figures correctly indicate the measuring units and the source?</li> <li>• Are the graphs and figures correctly named and numbered?</li> <li>• Are the data presented in graphs and figures correctly valued and interpreted in the article?</li> <li>• Are the graphs and figures well proportioned</li> </ul>	<input type="checkbox"/> poor <input type="checkbox"/> needs improvements <input type="checkbox"/> average <input type="checkbox"/> good <input type="checkbox"/> excellent

