Guidelines for Referees

GENERAL ISSUES

The reviewers are asked in case they have either a time problem or a conflict of interest to contact the editor who assigned the manuscript as soon as possible. Editors may thereupon extend the deadline or cancel the review assignment as appropriate.

Reviewers are asked not to discuss the manuscript with its authors either during the review process or at any time previous to its actual publication.

The manuscript provided for reviewing should not be cited or referred to in any way prior to its publication or without asking for the author’s permission.

REVIEWING THE MANUSCRIPT

The reviewers are asked to consider the following aspects:

Contents

Relevance of the topics and approach to the GS (e.g., does it fall within one of the journal’s research domains; is it relevant, interesting and does it make a real contribution to advancing research in the area? Is argumentation sound and consistent; is analysis valid and coherent and conclusions reasonable? Is the paper properly focussed and organized? Is the style appropriate?

English

The editor should have checked that the paper is written in intelligible English before passing it on for review, as reviewers are not expected to correct any language deficiencies.

REFEREE REPORT

The full review report, including criticisms, recommended changes, queries, will be passed directly to the author, together with the editors’ final decision concerning the acceptance or rejection of the manuscript. Reviewers are asked to adopt a critical note, yet constructive and unbiased, so as to initiate and promote accurate and relevant scientific dialogue with the author and editors.

Reviewers may send further and more informal comments on the articles submitted for the benefit of the editors alone.

FORMAT

The review report should be organized in such a way as to summarize the general impression and the major findings in the article in the introductory paragraph, underscoring at the same time its
major shortcomings. Editors expect this paragraph to be followed by numbered comments that
clearly distinguish between major and minor points.
As this report will also be sent to the authors it should be formal and clear.

The report should be unequivocal in recommending one of the following:

- Accept (with or without minor suggestions)
- Accept, subject to minor revisions.
- Accept, subject to major revisions.
- Reject.

In case the paper under review would require serious changes in order to qualify for publication and
reviewers feel that its shortcomings could still be corrected within a reasonable period of time, then
acceptance with revisions could be recommended. Under this category manuscripts are returned to
authors with a request for minor or major revisions prior to publication. Since editorial decisions
are based on evaluations from several sources, reviewers should not expect the editors to support
every recommendation.

After completing the review report, reviewers should make sure it is anonymous, and then send it
as an attachment (preferably a PDF) to the GS editor who originally assigned the manuscript to
them. ‘REVIEW REPORT’ should be typed in the subject box.

The Editors