

Official journal website

"For reviewers"

businessexcellence.net.efzg.hr

"Peer Review Policy"

businessexcellence.net.efzg.hr

Peer Review Guidelines

The journal operates under a double-anonymized peer-review model (see [NISO Peer Review Terminology](#)). Reviewers play a vital role in maintaining the academic quality, rigor, and international relevance of the journal.

Peer Review Model (NISO Standard Terminology)

- Identity transparency: double anonymized (author and reviewer identities are not disclosed to each other; both identities are known only to the editor).
- Reviewer interacts with: editor (all communication is mediated through the editor via the OJS system; there is no direct interaction between reviewers or between reviewers and authors).
- Review information published: none (peer review reports are stored in OJS and accessible only to editor; reports and reviewer identities are not published alongside the article).
- Post-publication discussion: letters to the editor (see [Publication Ethics](#)).

The journal applies external peer review.

Reviewers must not attempt to identify authors in a double-anonymized process. If a reviewer recognizes the authors, identifies an institutional link, or if anonymity is otherwise compromised at any stage, the reviewer must inform the editor and withdraw from the review.

Who are our reviewers?

- Members of the academic community with advanced expertise in relevant fields.
- Independent, most often external experts, both domestic and international.
- Typically hold a doctoral degree and have a proven research track record.
- Actively engaged in research, with publications in the same or related fields.
- In exceptional cases, members of the Editorial Board may be invited as reviewers when highly specific subject expertise is required, provided there is no conflict of interest.

Before Accepting a Review Invitation

Before agreeing to review a manuscript, please consider:

- **Expertise:** Is the subject within your academic competence?
- **Availability:** Can you complete the review within 4–6 weeks?
- **Conflicts of Interest:** Reviewers must disclose any actual, potential, or perceived conflicts of interest (e.g., recent collaboration, same department/institution, financial or personal relationships). If a conflict exists, reviewers should decline the invitation. If a conflict becomes apparent after accepting, reviewers must inform the editor and withdraw from the review.
- **Timely Response:** Please respond promptly to review invitation.

Reviewer Responsibilities

- Maintain strict confidentiality of all manuscripts.
- Do not involve anyone else (e.g., colleagues or junior researchers/students) in the review or share manuscript/review materials without the editor's prior permission. If permission is granted, inform the editor of all individuals involved and maintain full confidentiality.
- Ensure objectivity and impartiality in their evaluation, focusing solely on scholarly merit and relevance to the journal's scope.
- Apply critical thinking and constructiveness, offering reasoned arguments and specific suggestions for improvement.
- Communicate at a high professional standard, avoiding personal remarks or inappropriate language.
- Reviewers must not contact authors directly; all communication must be mediated through the editor via OJS.
- Report any ethical concerns (plagiarism, duplicate publication, data falsification) confidentially to the Editorial Office:

✉ editor-be@net.efzg.hr

Subject: *Ethical Concern* – [Manuscript ID]

Manuscript Categorization and Review Procedures

Each research manuscript is normally reviewed by two independent external reviewers. In cases where reviewers provide conflicting recommendations, the handling editor may either invite a third reviewer or make a final editorial decision based on the available evidence.

When reviewing a manuscript, please evaluate it within the context of its designated category:

- **Original Research Papers:** present unpublished results of original research. Reviewers should assess the rigor of the methods, the validity of the analysis, and whether the conclusions are fully supported by the data.
- **Review Articles:** provide a comprehensive and critical overview of a research topic, synthesizing prior studies and evaluating the current state of knowledge. Reviewers should consider whether the article offers a balanced, well-structured synthesis and contributes to theoretical or practical understanding.

- **Preliminary Communications:** report initial or partial findings from ongoing research. These manuscripts are shorter in scope and intended for early dissemination. Reviewers should evaluate novelty, methodological clarity, and the potential of the findings to stimulate further research.
- **Professional Papers:** contribute to professional practice or policy development. These manuscripts do not contain original scientific research. Reviewers should focus on the paper's practical value, clarity, and evidence-based contribution to professional audiences.

Conference Papers

- Conference-based submissions may occasionally be received by the Journal as extended and substantially revised versions of papers previously presented at academic conferences. Only manuscripts derived from conference abstracts, not from full published papers, are eligible for peer-review.
- These submissions are treated as new manuscripts and are evaluated under the Journal's independent peer review policy. While the Journal applies a double-anonymous review process, complete anonymity cannot always be guaranteed for work that has been publicly presented.
- When reviewing such manuscripts, reviewers should consider:
 - whether the submission demonstrates significant new content or development beyond the original conference version,
 - whether the reused materials (tables, figures, or data) are properly acknowledged and cited to the original conference source,
 - and whether the paper meets the same scholarly and methodological standards expected of all submissions.
- Accepted articles must include a clear statement of the conference title, date, and location.

Non-Peer Reviewed Content

Certain content types (e.g., editorials, book reviews, announcements, and corrections) are not externally peer-reviewed and are assessed internally by the Editorial Board prior to publication.

When reviewing a manuscript, please consider the following key aspects:

- Originality and novelty
- Scope alignment
- Theoretical foundation
- Methodological soundness
- Clarity of analysis and interpretation
- Structure and clarity of presentation
- Scholarly or practical contribution.

Full evaluation criteria and guidance are provided within the OJS system after a review assignment is accepted. In case of technical or system-related support for the OJS platform, please contact the Editorial Office:

✉ editor-be@net.efzg.hr

Subject: *OJS support* – [Manuscript ID]

Confidentiality and Use of Content

Reviewers must comply with the journal's confidentiality and use-of-content requirements as set out in the [Peer Review Policy](#).

Any breach is considered serious misconduct.

Use of AI Tools

Reviewers may use generative AI only for language / grammar / formatting improvements of their own review report, without inputting any manuscript content or identifiers. Uploading or inputting manuscripts (or any identifiable manuscript content) into generative AI tools is prohibited. For details, see the [Peer Review Policy](#).

Making Your Recommendation

At the end of your review, select one of the following recommendations:

- Accept (ready or only minor edits needed)
- Minor Revisions (language, formatting, referencing fixes)
- Major Revisions (substantial theoretical, methodological, or analytical changes)
- Reject (out of scope, flawed, lacks contribution).

In the reviewer form, please structure your report into:

- Comments to the Editor
- Comments to the Authors.

Recognition and Contribution

Reviewers play a vital role in the journal's community. As appreciation:

- Certificates of Review are available upon request.
- Outstanding reviewers may be recognized annually on the journal website.
- Dedicated reviewers may be invited to join the editorial team.

Commitment to Diversity and Inclusion

We encourage participation from reviewers of all backgrounds, geographic regions, and career stages, reflecting our commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion in scholarly publishing.

Editor-in-Chief
Tonći Lazibat



Web site 'Peer Review Policy':
businessexcellence.net.efzg.hr

Peer Review Policy

Peer Review Process

All research manuscripts (including original research articles, review articles, and preliminary communications) and professional papers submitted to the journal undergo a double-anonymized peer review process. Authors and reviewers remain anonymous to each other; their identities are known only to the editor. All communication between authors and reviewers is mediated through the editor and managed via the journal's online submission system (OJS).

If any author of a submitted manuscript is affiliated with the same institution as the Editor-in-Chief or the initially assigned editor, the manuscript must be reassigned to a handling editor who is not affiliated with the same institution as the author.

Peer review reports are securely stored in OJS and are accessible to editor for internal traceability and auditability.

Review information published: The journal does not publish peer review reports or reviewer identities alongside the published article.

Authors are responsible for ensuring that the manuscript and all files are prepared for double-anonymized review (e.g., removing identifying information from the text, acknowledgements, and file metadata).

In a double-anonymized process, reviewers must not attempt to identify authors; if the authors are recognized, an institutional link is identified, or anonymity is otherwise compromised at any stage, the reviewer must inform the editor and withdraw from the review.

Peer Review Model (NISO Terminology)

The journal labels its peer review model using NISO Peer Review Terminology:

- Identity transparency: double anonymized
- Reviewer interacts with: editor (via OJS)
- Review information published: none
- Post-publication discussion: Letters to the Editor

External peer review is applied to all eligible manuscript types as described in this policy.

External Review

Each eligible manuscript type that undergoes external peer review under this policy (research manuscripts and professional papers) is evaluated by at least two independent external reviewers.

Reviewers are selected to avoid conflicts of interest; editors must not appoint reviewers who are currently affiliated with the same institution as any of the authors and should also avoid appointing recent collaborators.

Reviewers must disclose any actual, potential, or perceived conflicts of interest and decline or withdraw from the review at any stage, where appropriate.

Members of the Editorial Board are generally not invited to serve as reviewers. However, in exceptional cases where highly specific expertise is required and no conflicts of interest exist, an Editorial Board member may be invited; in such cases, they are subject to the same confidentiality and conflict-of-interest safeguards as all reviewers.

Confidentiality and Use of Content

- All submitted manuscripts, supplementary files, and peer review communications are confidential. Reviewers must not use or share any data, ideas, or information obtained through peer review for personal or professional advantage.
- Reviewers must not involve anyone else in the review (including colleagues or junior researchers/students) or share the manuscript/review materials without prior permission from the editor. If permission is granted, the reviewer must ensure confidentiality and disclose to the editor the names and roles of all individuals who contributed to the review.
- Manuscript content must not be used in the reviewer's own work until it is publicly available.
- Reviewers should not request citations primarily to increase citations to their own work or to specific journals; any citation suggestions must be directly relevant and justified.

Any breach of these obligations is considered serious misconduct.

Use of AI Tools

Reviewers must not upload or input any submitted manuscripts, supplementary files, or any identifiable manuscript content into generative AI systems or third-party tools/services.

Limited exception: reviewers may use generative AI solely for language, grammar, or formatting improvements of their own peer review report, provided that:

- no manuscript content is included (no quotations, paraphrases, data, tables/figures, methods/results descriptions, or other non-public details),
- no identifiers are included (e.g., manuscript ID, title, author/institution information),
- the reviewer remains fully responsible for the accuracy and integrity of the report.

Any breach of confidentiality via AI tools is classified as serious misconduct.

Editorial Decisions

Based on reviewers' reports, the editor may decide to:

- Accept the manuscript
- Request minor revisions
- Request major revisions
- Reject the submission.

In cases of conflicting reviews, a third reviewer may be invited. Revised manuscripts may undergo further review, particularly after major revisions.

Appeals

Authors may appeal an editorial decision within 30 days by submitting a brief, reasoned request to the Editorial Office (see our [Appeals process](#) for details). Appeals are reviewed in accordance with the journal's complaints and appeals procedure.

Suggested Reviewers (optional)

Authors may propose up to three potential reviewers in the cover letter at the time of submission. These suggestions are non-binding and primarily serve to expand the journal's reviewer database. Suggested reviewers are not automatically assigned; they may be considered at the editor's discretion after independent verification and conflict-of-interest screening.

Suggested names must include:

- Full name
- Institutional affiliation
- Official institutional email address

The editorial team makes the final decision on reviewer selection, including assessment of potential conflicts of interest.

Non-Peer-Reviewed Content

Certain contributions (e.g., editorials, book reviews, announcements, and corrections) are evaluated internally by the Editorial Board and do not undergo external peer review.

Post-Publication Discussion

Post-publication scholarly discussion is possible via Letters to the Editor (see [Publication Ethics: Post-Publication Discussion](#)). Accepted items are published with their own DOI and linked to the original article.

Detailed reviewer responsibilities and procedures are provided in the [Peer Review Guidelines](#) and form an integral part of this policy.

Editor-in-Chief
Tonći Lazibat