

# Guidelines for Referees

## *Erasmus Journal for Philosophy and Economics*

---

Reviewing a manuscript written by a fellow academic is a privilege, and it can also be an exciting and enjoyable experience. But it is a time-consuming responsibility as well. The EJPE and its editors, authors, and readers therefore appreciate your willingness to take on this essential role. These Guidelines are particularly intended to help Young Scholars who have less experience with refereeing.

### **GENERAL ISSUES**

If you have either a time problem or a conflict of interest, please contact the editor who assigned the manuscript as soon as possible. Editors may extend the deadline or cancel the review assignment as appropriate.

**Do not discuss the manuscript with its authors either during the review process or at any time previous to its actual publication.** Despite the intentions of the blind review process, the author's identity may sometimes be apparent. Although it may seem natural and reasonable to discuss points of difficulty or disagreement directly with an author, especially if you are in favour of publication, this practice is prohibited. Other reviewers and the journal editors may come to different judgements, so the author may be misled by having "cleared things up" with a particular referee directly.

**The manuscript provided to you for review is a privileged document.** Please protect it from any form of exploitation. Do not cite a manuscript or refer to the work it describes before it has been published, and do not use the information that it contains for the advancement of your own research without proper permission.

### **REVIEWING THE MANUSCRIPT**

Explicitly consider the following (non-exhaustive) aspects:

#### **Contents**

Relevance of the discussion to the EJPE:

*e.g., Does it fall within one of our research domains?*

Significance to the target scientific community:

*e.g., Is this an important or useful contribution? Is it interesting?*

Originality.

Grasp of relevant literature.

## **Argument**

Soundness of exegesis and analysis.

Soundness of methodology, argumentation, and conclusions:

e.g., *Does the argument successfully support the main claims?*

Organization and coherence.

e.g., *Is the paper appropriately focussed?*

## **Style** (Note: not usually grounds for outright rejection)

Appropriate academic tone: civility to interlocutors; claims expressed carefully; etc

Appropriate literature citations and quotations.

Adequacy of title and abstract.

Appropriateness of figures and tables.

Appropriateness of supplemental material intended for publishing (if applicable).

## **English**

The editor should have checked that the paper is written in intelligible English before passing it on for review. If you nevertheless find a paper difficult to read due to its English you should recommend a language check in your review (or, if it prevents you from completing a fair review, immediately return it to the editor). But you are certainly not required or expected to correct any deficiencies of style, syntax, or grammar.

## **REFEREE REPORT**

Your full review report, including all your criticisms, suggested changes, and recommendations, will be passed directly to the author (together with the editors' final decision about the publication or rejection of the manuscript). Please adopt a critical but constructive and impartial tone toward the manuscript under review, with the aim of promoting effective, accurate, and relevant scientific communication with the author as well as with the editors. **Since we expect many of our submissions to come from Young Scholars, detailed, encouraging, and constructive criticism concerning possible improvements of the manuscripts is especially appreciated.** Please avoid dogmatic or dismissive statements, particularly about the novelty of the work, and substantiate all your criticisms and recommendations as much as possible.

**You may also send additional and less formal confidential remarks about the manuscript for the benefit of the editors alone.** Please make sure that such remarks are clearly separated from the review report intended for the authors, and that the review report itself is complete and intelligible without them.

**Format:** Organize your review report so that an introductory paragraph summarizes the major findings of the article, gives your overall impression of the paper, and highlights the major shortcomings. This paragraph should be followed by specific, numbered comments that clearly distinguish major and minor points. Since the review report will also be sent to the author, please keep it suitably formal and clear.

Your report should explicitly recommend one of the following:

- **Accept (with or without minor optional suggestions)**
- **Accept, subject to minor revisions.**
- **Accept, subject to major revisions.**
- **Reject.**

Note that very few papers qualify for an immediate, unconditional acceptance. There can be various reasons to recommend the outright rejection of a paper, for example: a total lack of relevance or originality, or irreparably poor organization. If you feel that the deficiencies can be corrected within a reasonable period of time (1 to 2 months), then recommend acceptance with revisions. Under this category manuscripts are returned to authors with a request for minor or major revisions prior to publication. Since editorial decisions are based on evaluations from several sources, reviewers should not expect the editors to support every recommendation.

After completing your review report, make sure it is **anonymous**, and then send it as an attachment (preferably a **PDF**) to the EJPE editor who originally assigned the manuscript to you at <[editors@ejpe.org](mailto:editors@ejpe.org)>. Please type 'REVIEW REPORT' in the subject box.

**The Editors**  
[editors@ejpe.org](mailto:editors@ejpe.org)

**Erasmus Journal for Philosophy and Economics**  
<http://ejpe.org>