Reviewer Guidelines

Your report is an indispensable input into our editorial decision. We recognize that preparing a report requires substantial effort and, on behalf of our readership, we express our gratitude for your collaboration in this editorial process. All IJCBE papers are double-blind peer reviewed.

Conflicts of Interest: You are likely to be conflicted, and should recuse yourself from the review if there is conflict of interest. For example, conflicts can arise if your current research is competing with the submitted paper. Please contact your Editor if you have any doubts about whether you are conflicted.

Accepting/Declining the Assignment: Reviewers are occasionally over committed to the extent that providing a timely, in depth report is not feasible. In such cases, please inform the editor right away so that this paper can be reassigned. If you have already reviewed the paper for a different journal, then please inform the Editor. You may be asked to assess whether the paper has been substantially improved (incorporated your feedback) since your review. In these cases, the editor always seeks the advice of another reviewer.

The Content of Your Report: Most helpful for us is balanced feedback that explains the paper’s strengths and weaknesses, and that assesses the novelty of its contribution relative to the relevant literatures. Avoid lengthy, literature reviews or reconstructions of the arguments in the paper. Your report should adopt a professional tone and, above all, should reflect a thorough reading of the research. We anticipate that the depth of your report will reflect your assessment of the paper’s prospects – relatively shorter reports for weak papers are fine, though it is always imperative that you express your scientific concerns with precision. Imagine the critical and constructive report that you would want to receive on your paper.

For theory papers, please dig into the model, explain the central economic mechanism, comment on the distance between assumptions and results, and check the proofs. For empirical papers, please focus on what you see as central weaknesses in terms of links to economic theory, and the chosen econometric strategy and robustness checks. For both types of papers, you should provide clear and concise reasons why you see your proposed revisions as material to the theme of the paper.

Please outline what you believe is required for the paper to become publishable in the IJCBE. When recommending a rejection, please give specific objective/scientific reasons why, with reference to relevant related literatures and sections/tables/equations in the paper. This process is collaborative – we will occasionally reach out to you for clarification, and you should feel free to contact us about issues that concern you, be they ethical or substantive.