

---

## **e-Journal of Economics & Complexity, 2015 - ...**

---

### **JE&C instructions to reviewers**

e-JE&C is an open access e-journal and relies on volunteer peer reviewers to ensure its editorial standards in a submitted article. Articles will typically be sent to 2 peer reviewers (a preliminary email, including an abstract of the manuscript, will be sent to invite them to review a manuscript, by asking them to accept or reject the review). When possible, the reviewers will come from two continents. The identities of both reviewers and author(s) remain anonymous to each other, except when reviewer wants to be known to author(s).

Reviewers are expected to help e-JE&C ensure that the article is well designed and executed and meets "e-JE&C Author Guidelines" (see: "JE&C Information for Authors 2014.docx").

In particular, reviewer responsibilities include the following:

1. Provide written feedback on the merits and scientific value of the work in general, together with rationale for his/her opinion by avoiding personal comments or criticism (a couple of paragraphs highlighting what he/she considers the strengths and, especially, weaknesses of the article), and summarize such comments by using a standard 4-points scale of rating:

0 = Reject. The paper is regarded not suitable for publication.

1 = Consider accepting. Major changes are required, explaining them and author(s) will be asked to revise the paper and resubmit with a letter

to the handling editor, explaining changes made to address the reviewers' comments.

- 2 = Conditional acceptance. Minor changes are required, and the revised paper will not go through another round of review.
- 3 = Accept. The paper is accepted as it is, or the paper should be accepted but there are some potential improvements that the author(s) have the option to make.

The overall recommendation should consider the "e-JE&C Author Guidelines" and, in particular, originality of the article, technical soundness, significance, clarity of presentation, including English readability (articles may be written by non-native English authors and some grammatical improprieties are inevitable), relevance, and length.

2. Make comments and suggest ways to improve it, by entering comments directly into the document as referred to single sentences and/or words (if the reviewer prefers to compose his/her critique in a separate review form document, he/she may wish to use plain text, by retaining the format to address each comment to single sentences and/or words).
3. Reviewers are expected to make their substantive comments available to both authors and editor. However reviewers have the opportunity to specify that their review is to be shared with the author, or is intended for the editor only. Typically, only remarks of a delicate nature be conveyed exclusively to the editor. Also, in order to ensure confidentiality, reviewers are pleased do not sign their name in their review.
4. Provide review as soon as possible within 3 weeks days. If a reviewer foresees needing more time, he/she should contact the editorial team.

Marco Zupi, Editor-in-chief

International University of Hanoi, Bac Ha (Viet Nam)