



ISSN 2232-8823 (Print)

ISSN 2232-9633 (Online)

INSTRUCTIONS TO REVIEWERS

„Economy and Market Communication Review –

Časopis za ekonomiju i tržišne komunikacije“

E-mail: emc@apeiron-edu.eu

Web: www.emc-review.com

All papers evaluated by the Editorial Board to be meeting the requirements of the Instructions to Authors are forwarded for peer review. At this stage, they are reviewed by at least two independent reviewers who are specialised in the field of work for which the Editorial Board has agreed that it falls within the scope of the journal.

The procedure of peer review is double-blind, for both authors and reviewers. The reviewers are sent coded papers, with no names of authors, which they must evaluate as per instructions and on a prescribed form (Suitability of Paper for Publication Form) received by the Editorial Board. The completed Suitability of Paper for Publication Form must then be returned via OJS platform to the Editorial Board.

The reviewer's comments intended for authors are sent to them via OJS platform. In case of major revision needed, the paper will be reviewed once again. The reviewer must not undertake the peer review process should he/she deem himself/herself unqualified to do so, and must notify the Editorial Board of any potential conflict of interest or irregularities relative to the

paper received. Each paper received for review should be treated as confidential. The Editorial Board shall render the final decision on publication and classification of the paper based on the opinions of reviewers provided in the Suitability of Paper for Publication Form and based on the corrections undertaken by the authors.

SUITABILITY OF PAPER FOR PUBLICATION FORM

-review form-

I. PAPERTITLE:

II. PAPER EVALUATION (in accordance with the Instructions to Authors):

Criteria	YES	NO
Title fully reflects the content of the paper		
Topic of the paper falls within the scope of the journal		
Topic is current and relevant		
The paper contains all parts in line with the Instructions to Authors		
Abstract is designed in accordance with the Instructions to Authors		
Extended summary in English is conceptualized in accordance with the Instructions to Authors		
Key words reflect the content of the paper		
Introduction is designed in accordance with the Instructions to Authors		
The author relies on the relevant general research conducted to date in the field of work in question		
Appropriate methodology has been applied		
Methodology has been precisely defined		
The author compares relevant research conducted to date in the selected area with his/her own research		
The interpretation of research results is valid		
Conclusion is designed in accordance with the Instructions to Authors		
The paper provides new and original contribution		
The paper's style of writing and language are clear		
The paper uses tables, charts and figures in an appropriate and clear manner		
The length of paper is in accordance with the Instructions to Authors		
References have been cited in accordance with the Instructions to Authors		

Explanation (only if the answer is "NO"):

Final evaluation

Mark:

(Excellent-----Poor)

5 4 3 2 1

Explanation of the final evaluation (if reviewer sees it necessary):

I. REVIEWER'S COMMENTS:

Confidential comments for the Editorial Board:

Comments submitted to the author:

II. REVIEWER'S RECOMMENDATION FOR PUBLICATION OF THE PAPER:

RECOMMENDATION (put the selected recommendation in bold)
Accepted
Accepted after undertaking revision as per comments*
Not accepted

* The paper is returned to reviewer for opinion

III. CLASSIFICATION OF PAPER:

CLASS (put the selected recommendation in bold)
Original scientific paper**
Preliminary report***
Review****
Professional paper*****

**paper which contains the results of an original scientific research unpublished to date;

*** paper which contains the new results of a scientific research useful to be published promptly;

**** paper which contains an original concise and critical overview of an area and provides a contribution given the papers published to date;

***** paper which contains useful contributions from and for the profession but does not necessarily represent an original research.

IV. REVIEWER'S DATA:

Name	
Title	
Area, field and branch of science	
Institution where the reviewer works	
Address	
Telephone	
E-mail	
Bank account	
Personal identification number	
Date of receipt of paper for peer review	
Date of sending the Form to the Editorial Board	
Signature	