

Instruction for reviewers

Editorial board of the „Law and Economy“ strives to ensure the high quality of published papers. Therefore, the participation and opinion of the reviewers in assessing whether the paper is suitable for publication is essential.

- 1) Deadline for sending the review is fifteen days. Based on the decision of the Editor-in-chief, and in agreement with the reviewer, that deadline may be extended or shortened.
- 2) During the assessment of the suitability of paper to be published, a double-blind peer review is made. Review is anonymous in both directions, which means that identity of the author remains unknown to reviewers and *vice versa*.

The data on the review and the paper itself are confidential and no information can be provided about them, unless it is necessary in a particular case and if it has been approved by the Editor-in-Chief.

If reviewers notice a violation of the code of ethics and science, they should inform the Editorial board. The same applies to the existence of a conflict of interest between the reviewer and the author of the paper.

- 3) During the assessment of a suitability of a paper, reviewers should pay particular attention to whether the rules of scientific methodology regarding citation of other people's sources and allegations are respected, i.e. whether there is a violation of intellectual property rights and other third party rights and whether the paper is the result of author's own research.

In review, the following is assessed:

- 1) whether the title of the paper reflects the content and purpose of the paper;
- 2) whether the summary is relevant and summed up;
- 3) whether the key words are reflecting the essence of the paper;
- 4) whether in introduction is clearly defined the purpose of the research;
- 5) whether the author, with a brief overview of the general research, introduces into the issues he is exploring in his work;
- 6) whether the methodology is clearly defined;
- 7) whether an overview of the research in the selected field has been elaborated (supported with citations from the scientific literature);
- 8) if the conclusion also contains clearly stated statements, open questions, and recommendations for further research;
- 9) whether the article is technically well-done and in line with the journal's propositions;

- 10) whether the length of the article is appropriate;
- 11) whether the article is legible, written in a standard language, free of spelling and grammatical errors, relevant and interesting to readers.

The reviewer makes a proposal of the category of the article, i.e. gives a note whether it is an original scientific paper, a review paper or a professional paper. The final decision on the category of the paper is made by Editor-in-Chief.

- 1) Original scientific paper represents the first publication of original research results in such a form that the research can be repeated and the established facts verified; a review of the most recent work on a particular subject area; the work of an individual researcher or a group of researchers with the aim of summarizing, analysing, evaluating or synthesizing already published information. It brings new syntheses that also include the result of author's own research.
- 2) The review paper presents a specific problem and a review of relevant literature in the field, indicates similarities, differences and shortcomings, and contains a theoretically based position of the author.
- 3) Professional paper is a review of what is already known, with emphasis on the usability of the results of original research and dissemination of knowledge. The complexity of the text is tailored to the needs of users and readers of professional or scientific journal in which it was published.

Reviewer suggests to Editorial board:

- 1) to publish the paper;
- 2) conditional publication, with a reviewer's comments;
- 3) to reject the paper (negative review).

In case of proposing conditional publication, the reviewer is expected to make suggestions regarding changes (shortening, reworking, or omitting parts) that may be provided within the review form or in the text itself (*track changes*). In case of suggesting that manuscript is not eligible for publication (negative review), reviewers are expected to provide a detailed explanation of why they consider paper is ineligible for publication. In any case, reviewers have the right to propose changes to improve the quality of the paper.