

Guide for Reviewers



EUROPEAN JOURNAL
OF BUSINESS SCIENCE
AND TECHNOLOGY

European Journal of Business Science and Technology is an English-language, open access, double-blind peer review, multidisciplinary journal. The journal crosses traditional discipline boundaries, publishing original research papers in the fields of economics, business and technology, devoting special attention to international business and economics, management, marketing, business law, social and public policy, management information systems, and information technology.

Only high-quality manuscripts following standards of scientific work and corresponding to the scope of the journal will be considered for publishing. The editors may reject any manuscript that in his opinion is not suitable for publication in EJOBSAT, without specification of any reasons for doing so. The editor reserves a right to return to authors any manuscript for substantive revision and re-submission without consulting reviewers.

All the reviewed manuscripts must be in accordance with the [Instructions for Authors](#).

If a submission satisfies the journal requirements, two reviewers are asked for a review. The editors ensure that appropriate reviewers are selected for submissions. The journal uses the double-blind peer-review process (the review process is anonymous - the identity of both the author and reviewer is kept hidden). On receiving both reviewers' reports, the editors decide either to accept or reject the manuscript (in case of similar reviewer recommendations) or to request a third report.

Review process description

Reviewers are appointed via the journal system. A notification e-mail is sent to reviewers with an invitation to review a manuscript.

Reviewers should take the following steps:

1. Notify submission's editors whether they will undertake the review.

Before you accept or decline an invitation to review, please consider if the manuscript matches your area of expertise and if you have time for the review.

2. Declare all existing competing interests.

Accepting a manuscript for a review you declare that you have no financial or non-financial, professional, or personal competing interests in relation to the reviewed manuscript.

3. Download and review (on screen or by printing) the files associated with the submission.

4. Fill in a review form in the journal system.

The journal system will guide you to fill in appropriate fields and evaluate given criteria.

5. If necessary, upload additional files for the editor and/or author to support the report.
6. Select a recommendation for the journal editors:
 - a. Accept the paper without changes or with minor revisions
 - b. Accept the paper with major revisions
 - c. Reject the paper but allow to re-submit after extensive review
 - d. Reject the paper
7. Submit the review form to complete the review process.

Please note that if you recommend acceptance, the manuscripts should provide high-quality original approaches, strictly implemented methods or models, and scientific advances in the field. Where improvements are needed, a recommendation for major or minor revisions is typical. If recommending revisions, state specific changes you feel need to be made. The author can then reply to each point in turn. Considering that many authors are not native English speakers, the writing must be excellent when the manuscript is in the final form.

Ethical guidelines for reviewers

The contents and existence of a submitted manuscript must be considered as confidential until the manuscript is published. If the manuscript is not accepted for the journal, then all aspects of its review in this journal are to be considered as confidential without time limit. Reviewers are kindly requested to adhere to this important principle.

Reviewers are expected to act in accordance with COPE's ethical guidelines for [peer reviewers](#).

Acknowledgement

A meaningful peer review is a time-consuming but a crucial process for publishing high quality research outputs. Therefore, we are grateful for reviewers' efforts and advice. Thoughtful reviews enhance manuscripts quality, which in turn provide better information to readers, ultimately improve research contribution of manuscripts. Thank you.