

Reviewer Responsibilities

Contribution to editorial decisions

Peer review assists the editor in making editorial decisions and, through the editorial communication with the author, may also assist the author in improving the manuscript.

Promptness

Any invited referee who feels unqualified to review the research reported in a manuscript or knows that its timely review will be impossible should immediately notify the editor so that alternative reviewers can be contacted.

Confidentiality

Any manuscript received for review must be treated as a confidential document. They must not be shown to or discussed with others except if authorized by the editor.

Standards of objectivity

Reviews should be conducted objectively. Personal criticism of the author is unacceptable. Referees should express their views clearly with appropriate supporting arguments.

Acknowledgment of sources

Reviewers should identify relevant published work that has not been cited by the authors. Any statement that an observation, derivation, or argument had been previously reported should be accompanied by the relevant citation. A reviewer should also call to the editor's attention any substantial similarity or overlap between the manuscript under consideration and any other published data of which they have personal knowledge.

Disclosure and conflict of interest

Privileged information or ideas obtained through peer review must be kept confidential and not used for personal advantage. Reviewers should not consider evaluating manuscripts in which they have conflicts of interest resulting from competitive, collaborative, or other relationships or connections with any of the authors, companies, or institutions connected to the submission

Suggestions for the reviewers

When reviewing a manuscript, please remember it is anonymous and confidential. Your suggestions and opinions meant for the editor only ought to be separated from those made available to the author. Whatever your opinion, the final decision is with the editor, and the justification will be available upon request. Yet, even in the case of rejecting the manuscript, the reviewer is requested to make constructive comments so as to help the author improving the paper. Please, pay special attention to the points listed in the review sheet and, in addition, whether **International Journal of Contemporary Management (IJCM)** is the right journal to publish the manuscript and whether the manuscript is easy to read and understand. This section, which may include other comments, may be reserved for editorial use only.

Moreover, when preparing your numbered comments addressed to the author, cover the following issues:

1. The abstract and the key words – are they clear enough and in accordance with the contents of the paper?

2. The objective of the study – is it well defined and formulated?
3. Material and Methods – are the participants of the study and the methods used adequately described?
4. The results – do they seem credible and consistent with the title and objective?
5. Figures and tables – are they well designed and relevant? This point requires special care.
6. The conclusions – do they follow from the presented results? Are not the findings, i.e. facts, presented as conclusions?
7. Are the references relevant with respect to the text? Any obvious references not cited?