

## ***Guidelines for Reviewers: International Conference Proceedings Economic Policy***

### **Objective:**

As a reviewer for the conference proceedings, your role is crucial in maintaining the scientific and professional integrity of the conference. Your assessment should be thorough, unbiased, and focused primarily on the scientific and professional aspects of the submitted papers.

### **Focus Areas for Review:**

- **Relevance of the Topic:** Evaluate if the topic is pertinent to the conference's themes and current scientific discourse.
- **Explicitness of the Aim:** Determine if the paper's objectives are clearly stated and well-defined.
- **Alignment of Aim and Content:** Check if the aim is consistently and appropriately addressed throughout the paper.
- **Methodology:** Assess the relevance and clarity of the methods used. Ensure they are appropriately explained and suitable for the study.
- **Data and Evidence:** Critically evaluate the quality, relevance, and presentation of the data and evidence provided. Check for accuracy, completeness, and appropriate analysis.
- **Conclusions:** Evaluate the utility and clarity of the conclusions drawn. They should be well-supported by the data and analysis presented.
- **Original Contribution:** Critically analyze the paper for substantial original contributions to literature. Emphasize innovation and advancement in the field.
- **Writing Style:** Ensure the paper is well-written, clear, and comprehensible, adhering to academic standards.
- **References and Literature Review:** Evaluate the adequacy of the literature review and the relevance and recency of references cited.
- **Clarity of Figures and Tables:** Assess the clarity and relevance of any figures, tables, or additional materials. Ensure they effectively support the paper's content and are properly labeled and referenced.
- **Ethical Standards:** Ensure the paper adheres to ethical standards in research, including proper citations, avoiding plagiarism, and respecting intellectual property.

### **Evaluation Criteria:**

- **Not Suitable for Publication:** The paper does not meet the basic criteria for quality and relevance.
- **Submit Again After Major Editing:** The paper has potential but requires significant revisions to meet the standards.
- **Only Minor Corrections Needed:** The paper is of good quality but needs specific minor corrections. Decide whether or not to request a re-review (in case it is only a minor repair)
- **The Article is Suitable for Publication Without Changes:** The paper meets all criteria and is ready for publication.

### **Process:**

- Fill in all the information in the form below.

- Provide detailed comments and constructive feedback on each evaluation point where you give a negative opinion.
- Indicate whether a second review is necessary, especially in the case of minor revisions.
- In the case of major revisions, always expect a second review.
- Maintain confidentiality and impartiality throughout the review process.
- Final Decision:
  - Provide a clear and justified recommendation regarding the publication of the paper.
  - Remember that your recommendation plays a critical role in the decision-making process.

**Note:**

- Your expertise and judgment are invaluable in ensuring the high quality of the conference proceedings.
- Please adhere to the provided timeline for review to facilitate a smooth and efficient process.

Your thorough and objective review contributes significantly to the advancement of knowledge and the success of the international conference. We appreciate your commitment to upholding the highest standards of scientific and professional excellence.

**Communication with Editors:**

- **Conflicts of Interest:** Inform the editors of any potential conflicts of interest that might affect your review.
- **Questions and Clarifications:** Contact the editors if you have any questions or need clarifications regarding the review process or specific aspects of the paper.

## ***Review Form***

**Title of the paper:**

**Number of the paper:**

		YES	NO
I.	IS THE TOPIC OF THE PAPER RELEVANT TO THE SCOPE OF THE JOURNAL?		
II.	IS THE GOAL EXPLICITLY STATED WITHIN THE INTRODUCTION?		
III.	IS THE COMPOSITION OF THE PAPER COHERENT AND IMPLIED BY THE GOAL OF THE PAPER?		
IV.	ARE THE TOOLS (METHODS) THE AUTHOR USES REASONABLE AND WELL DESCRIBED?		
V.	ARE THE CONCLUSIONS RELATED TO/JUSTIFIED BY THE RESULTS PRESENTED BEFORE?		
VI.	IS THE WRITING STYLE CLEAR AND UNDERSTANDABLE?		
VII.	DOES THE PAPER PROVIDE A SUBSTANTIAL ORIGINAL CONTRIBUTION TO LITERATURE?		

**Further comments on the paper:**

**Recommendation:**

NOT SUITABLE FOR PUBLISHING	
RESUBMIT AFTER MAJOR IMPROVEMENTS	
ONLY MINOR CORRECTIONS ARE REQUIRED	
I prefer to evaluate the paper again	
THE PAPER IS SUITABLE TO BE PUBLISHED WITHOUT CHANGES	

**Administrator Notes:**

	YES	NO
--	-----	----

I.	DOES THE PAPER MEET THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE TEMPLATE?		
----	---	--	--