

## REVIEWER`S GUIDE

*AJEE* is an Open Access Journal which supports online submission and double-blind peer review system. These are the requirements to be followed by the reviewers while reviewing and other actions within publishing process. The best practice of international publishing community was used for these requirements:

<https://www.elsevier.com/reviewers/how-to-review>

<https://www.springer.com/gp/authors-editors/authorandreviewertutorials/submitting-to-a-journal-and-peer-review/peer-review-process/10534962>

<https://brill.com/page/PublishinginaBrillJournal/publishing-in-a-brill-journal>

The stages of review process in AJEE are the following:

1) choosing the candidates of reviewers, regarding two important points – their field of competence and absence of conflict of interests;

2) preparing the reviews according to the review`s requirements;

3) at this stage one of the following decisions are possible to be made:

- accept the article;

- revise with the improvement of the article according to the recommendations (in this case the 2-3 par. repeat only with the final decision-making by reviewer), or

- reject the article;

4) publication of the article after acceptance by two reviewers and final minor author`s corrections and the decision of the Editorial Board and the editor in chief.

At the first stage of the review`s procedure the editor looks through the candidates of reviewers in accordance with their field of competence trying to avoid the conflict of interests to ensure the high-quality and impartial opinion in reasonable time concerning the issues or parts of the review, listed below.

The structure of the review should consist of the following parts:

---

1) assessment whether the reviewed article concerns the specific area and the purpose of the Journal;

2) decision whether it is in line with the requirements for authors and ethical conditions of AJEE;

3) consideration whether the title and the content of the article suit each other and whether the arguments of the author are strict and prove their statements and conclusions;

4) analysis of the references whether they are the most relevant and important concerning the specific topic of the article.

The arguments of reviewers should be courteous and constructive. As a result, the summary of the reviewed article should contain the main reflexions the aspect whether it is a new and interesting research, assessed to be published in the Journal. The reviewers should be aware of the bias in their review due to the specific area of the Journal.

Among the main reasons for rejecting the manuscript are the following:

1) the requirements regarding the size of the manuscript or its structure or appropriate methods of research are not completed;

2) the old methodology and sources were used and new knowledge and valuable results failed to be presented;

3) inaccurate conclusions, assumptions or absence of any conclusions;

4) lack of up-to-date references or self-citations;

5) poor English language quality which leads to unclear meaning of the content.