**Article Review Form**

**Dear reviewers of IrJNS are kindly asked to fill:**

**A. FORMAL CRITERIA** (optional)

**B.** **SCIENTIFIC CRITERIA** (necessary)

**I. GENERAL INFORMATION**

**Article Title:**

**Article No:**

**Article Type:**

**Assigned Reviewer:**

**Due Date:**

**A. FORMAL CRITERIA**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **DECISION** | **SCALE** | **FORMAL****CRITERIA** |
| □ Accepted□ Accepted with minimumchanges□ To be Revised and resubmitted | **□** Respects the limit of length of article**□** Does not respect the limit of length of article | **Length of****article** |
| □ Accepted□ Accepted with minimumchanges□ To be Revised and resubmitted | **□** poor **□** needs improvements**□** average **□** good **□** excellent | **Design and****formal aspect** |

(Please choose the best item in scale)

**B.** **SCIENTIFIC CRITERIA**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **SCALE** | **QUESTIONS** | **REVIEW****CRITERIA** |
| **□** poor**□** needs improvements**□** average**□** good**□** excellent | • Are the problems discussed in the article new?• Does the article point out differences fromrelated research?• Does the article describe an innovativecombination of techniques from different disciplines?• Does the article introduce an idea that appears promising or might stimulate others to develop promising alternatives? | **I. ORIGINALITY**Positive responses for these questions represent high originality ratings. Negative responses for these questions represent low originality ratings. |
| **□** poor**□** needs improvements**□** average**□** good**□** excellent | • Does the article have a considerable contribution to a certain area of research?• Does the article stimulate discussion ofimportant issues or alternative points of view? | **II. SIGNIFICANCE**Positive responses for thesequestions represent high significance ratings. Negative responses for these questions represent low significance ratings. |
| **□** poor**□** needs improvements**□** average**□** good**□** excellent | • Does the article fit in REBS’s area of research?• Is the article relevant to REBS’s objectives?• Does the article present relevant information for its area of research? | **III. RELEVANCE**Positive responses for these questions represent high relevance ratings. Negative responses for these questions represent low relevance ratings. |
| **□** poor**□** needs improvements**□** average**□** good**□** excellent | • Does the article have a logic structure?• Is the article clearly written?• Is the article correctly written (from the grammar point of view)?• Does the article present in an appropriate way the terminology for its area of interest? | **IV. PRESENTATION**Positive responses for these questions represent highpresentation ratings.Negative responses for thesequestions represent lowpresentation ratings. |
| **□** poor**□** needs improvements**□** average**□** good**□** excellent | **V. CONTENT**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. |
| **□** poor**□** needs improvements**□** average**□** good**□** excellent | • Does the title clearly express the content of the article?• Is the title suggestive for the theme proposed by REBS (if there is a proposed theme)? | **5.1. Title** |
| **□** poor**□** needs improvements**□** average**□** good**□** excellent | • Is the abstract sufficiently informative?• Does the abstract describe the research and the results?• Does the abstract provide a good perspective on the final message of the article? | **5.2 Abstract** |
| **□** poor**□** needs improvements**□** average**□** good**□** excellent | • Does the introduction correctly highlight the current concerns in the area?• Does the introduction specify the researchobjectives?• Does the introduction present the articlecontribution to economic theory and/or practice improvements? | **5.3 Introduction** |
| **□** poor**□** needs improvements**□** average**□** good**□** excellent | • Are the methods used clearly explained?• Are the methods used validated /recognized?• Are the data and statistics used reliable? | **5.4 Methodology** |
| **□** poor**□** needs improvements**□** average**□** good**□** excellent | • Are the results clearly presented?• Are all relevant connections with others’ work/research declared?• Is the literature used in support of researchsufficiently comprehensive and current?• Do the results sufficiently avoid misinterpretation?• Do the results sufficiently avoid assumptions and speculations? | **5.5 Results** |
| **□** poor**□** needs improvements**□** average**□** good**□** excellent | • Are the conclusions correctly / logicallyexplained?• Do the conclusions sufficiently avoid misinterpretation?• Do the conclusions sufficiently avoid too general or biased information? | **5.6 Conclusions** |
| **□** poor**□** needs improvements**□** average**□** good**□** excellent | • Do the references reflect the latest work/research in the considered area??• Are the references correctly indicated in the article?• Are the references properly indexed and recorded in the bibliography? | **5.7 References** |
| **□** poor**□** needs improvements**□** average**□** good**□** excellent | • Do the tables correctly indicate the measuring units and the source?• Are the tables correctly named and numbered?• Are the data presented in tables correctlyvalued and interpreted in the article?• Are the tables well proportioned and aesthetically placed in the article? | **5.8 Tables** |
| **□** poor**□** needs improvements**□** average**□** good**□** excellent | • Do the graphs and figures properly illustrate the discussed subject?• Do the graphs and figures correctly indicate the measuring units and the source?• Are the graphs and figures correctly named and numbered?• Are the data presented in graphs and figures correctly valued and interpreted in the article?• Are the graphs and figures well proportioned and aesthetically placed in the article? | **5.9 Graphs and figures** |
| **□** Accepted**□** Rejected | • If an article (or parts from an article) is suspected to be a substantial copy of an earlier work, the article is rejected. | **VI. PLAGIARISM** |

**III. FINAL DECISION**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **OVERALL RATING** | **FINAL DECISION** |
| □ Poor | □ Rejected  |
| □ Needs improvements | □ To be Revised and resubmitted |
| □ Average | □ To be Revised and resubmitted□ Accepted with minimum changes |
| □ Good | □ Accepted with minimum changes |
| □ Excellent | □ Accepted |

**Iv. Further Comments to the Author/Editor-In-Chief**

|  |
| --- |
|  |