

**GUIDELINES**  
**for reviewing a manuscript submitted for publication**  
**to the journal *Applied Econometrics***

(revised April 15, 2022)

**1. Organizational issues**

1.1. Some papers may be rejected without seeking the advice of reviewers and the provision of reports but are scrutinized in detail by a member of the Editorial Board. This practice is only invoked for submission unlikely to prove publishable in *Applied Econometrics* to avoid unnecessarily prolonging the editorial process and taxing the limited resource of reviewers. In this case, a reasoned refusal is sent to the author. All manuscripts accepted for consideration are reviewed. As a rule, two reviewers are assigned for each paper.

1.2. Reviewing is *double blind*, that is, the reviewers' names are not communicated to the authors of the manuscript and vice versa. As a rule reviewing process takes no more than three months.

1.3. All correspondence between the reviewer and the author is managed by Editorial Board.

1.4. The opinion of the reviewer regarding the possibility of publication of the manuscript in the journal *Applied Econometrics* is a recommendation (i.e. it is not mandatory).

1.5. If necessary, the manuscript may be sent out for further review.

1.6. If the author disagrees with a reviewer report, he may send a reasoned reply, which is brought to the attention of the reviewer and the editorial board members.

1.7. The decision to publish the manuscript is made by the Editors, with consultations with Editorial Board members.

1.8. A new manuscript is recorded on the date it is received by the Editorial Board by e-mail (to addresses of the Editor-in-Chief and Vice-Editor).

1.9. The Editor-in-Chief (consulting if necessary with Editorial Board members) assigns the manuscript to a reviewer.

1.10. A reviewer report containing negative comments or other comments recommending for the revision of the original manuscript is sent back to the author. In a following response letter, the author(s) will have to show how the reviewer comments were taken into account in the revised version of the manuscript.

1.11. In the case of a positive review or in the case of a lack of reviewer comments that require revision of the submitted article, the manuscript is sent to the editorial board for discussion at the meeting of the "small Editorial Board" (Editor-in-Chief, Vice-Editors, and one or two members of the Editorial Board who are specialists on the article's subject area) and a decision on the submitted article's publication is made.

1.12. In the case that, according to the reviewer, a publication of the manuscript is not possible, but a revision is required, the final decision on the publication is delayed until the author's response is received. The subsequent author's response (which should be received by the editor within 3 months from the date the author acknowledged to have received the reviewer report) together with the revised manuscript and the list of changes, or a

reasoned letter of disagreement with the reviewer's comments, is then sent to the same reviewer for re-evaluation. Responses received after 3 months will be considered new manuscripts, with a repetition of the procedure described above.

1.13. Upon receipt of the final manuscript together with the reviewer's final report, a meeting of the "small Editorial Board" takes place to decide whether the manuscript is suitable for published or not. The editors reserve the right to disagree with the opinion of the reviewer and to send the manuscript to another referee, or to decide on their own.

## **2. Requirements for the reviewer's report**

2.1. The review must include a qualified analysis of the submitted article and an objective and reasoned assessment with its final recommendations.

2.2. The review should contain three mandatory parts: description, evaluation, and final judgment.

2.3. The first part of the review should contain a summary of the results found in the paper. It should focus not only on the abstract, introduction, and conclusion of the article, but its full text, as the author's final description of paper results may not adequately reflect what was actually accomplished in the full article.

2.4. The second part of the review should discuss:

- the relevance and importance of the problem discussed in the manuscript, from both a theoretical and a practical point of view;
- the presence of a task and its clarity, the validity of the approach to deal with the proposed task and its final findings;
- the adequacy of the scientific methods used, the correctness of the analytical tools, the presence of an original new model, etc;
- the research nature of the work and the elements of its creativity;
- the novelty of the obtained results with respect to the relative area of scientific research;
- the depth of analysis, logic, structure and overall presentation of the manuscript;
- the correspondence between the article and its title.

Reviewer comments and suggestions should be objective and reasoned, aimed at improving the scientific and methodological level of the manuscript.

2.5. The description and evaluation parts have to be sufficiently substantial to justify the conclusions of the third part of the report.

2.6. The final summarizing portion of the reviewer's report must contain one of the following three conclusions about the possibility of publication of the manuscript in the journal *Applied Econometrics*:

a) the manuscript is recommended for publication in the journal without any additional review (however, the reviewer can give some advices to improve the original manuscript);

b) the manuscript is not suitable for publication in the journal in its present state, and that a revised version is required together with a second round of reviewing. In such a case it is necessary to provide a list of comments and recommendations to address the problems of the original manuscript;

c) the manuscript is not suitable for publication in the journal and the reviewer does not see any possibility that a revised version can be accepted for publication.

2.7. The review should consider both the size of the article as a whole and its individual elements (text, tables, illustrations, bibliographic references), and discuss whether these elements should be published in the journal and that they comply with the topic discussed in the manuscript. Reviewer's recommendations on how to reduce the size of the manuscript are allowed (in this case, an indication of the elements to be cut out is required).