

## Reviewer Guidelines

Before agreeing to review a manuscript, reviewers are asked to consider the journal's Competing Interest policies and declare any conflicts (financial, intellectual) that would preclude a fair and balanced judgment of the manuscript they have been asked to review. By reviewing a paper, reviewers also agree to hold all information contained in the paper as confidential until publication. Peer reviewers are asked to submit their review within six (6) weeks. All reviewers will be notified of the editor's decision.

After receiving a review request Email and going to the submission URL provided in it, six easy review steps should be followed:

1. Accepting the review invitation by clicking on "will do the review" and sending or skipping the E-mail. This will open automatically.
2. Reading this reviewer guideline.
3. Downloading the manuscript and its supplementary file(s) by clicking on file names (e.g. 9923-36449-1-RV.DOC).
4. Filling the review form by clicking on its icon and saving it. Please note that the review form is only activated once you accept the review request and send or skip its automatic E-mail. You may make changes to the form at any time before completing the steps (submitting the review to the editor).
5. This is an optional step for reviewers who wish to upload one or more files in addition to the review form.
6. Selecting the final recommendation from the drop- down menu and submit it to the editor by clicking on "submit review to editor" button and sending the email that appears automatically to notify the section editor that you have completed the review. Please note that the drop- down menu will be activated only when you complete and save the review form.

Reviewers should consider the following substantive issues when reviewing manuscripts:

1. **Originality:** Does the paper contain new and significant information adequate to justify publication?
2. **Relationship to Literature:** Does the paper demonstrate an adequate understanding of the relevant literature in the field and cite an appropriate range of literature sources? Is any significant work ignored?
3. **Methodology:** Is the paper's argument built on an appropriate base of theory, concepts, or other ideas? Has the research or equivalent intellectual work on which the paper is based been well designed? Are the methods employed appropriate?
4. **Results:** Are results presented clearly and analyzed appropriately? Do the conclusions adequately tie together the other elements of the paper?
5. **Implications for research, practice, and/or society:** Does the paper identify clearly any implications for research, practice, and/or society? Does the paper bridge the gap between theory and practice? How can the research be used in practice (economic and commercial impact), in teaching, to influence public policy, in research (contributing to the body of knowledge)? What is the impact upon society (influencing public attitudes, affecting the quality of life)? Are these implications consistent with the findings and conclusions of the paper?
6. **Quality of Communication:** Does the paper clearly express its case, measured against the technical language of the field and the expected knowledge of the journal's readership? Has attention been paid to the clarity of expression and readability, such as sentence structure, jargon use, acronyms, etc.?