

## Review procedure

Publishing of papers in the journal *Acta Universitatis Bohemiae Meridionalis* is **conditioned by a successful double blind peer-review**. Reviewers are selected from among the most renowned experts in their field. Each paper is reviewed by at least two reviewers. The paper can be published in case of two supporting recommendations.

Reviewers are chosen from a number of experts on the basis of their proven qualification in the area discussed in the paper. Any of the reviewers is not allowed to be a staff of the same institution as the author or co-author of the submitted paper.

The review procedure has two stages:

**The first stage** is done by the editor-in-chief or by the assigned editor. The editor-in-chief is authorized to reject the submission or to recommend necessary changes if the paper does not meet the basic criteria of submitted papers (i.e. the topic is outside the scope of the journal, it does not respect formal criteria of writing). The first review process usually does not take more than 4 weeks.

The reviewer's report consists of the following parts:

- a) A review for authors prepared in a standard form enabling (detailed) comments.
- b) A confidential report to the editorial board (not required; not disclosed to authors).

The reviewer's decision can be:

- a. **To accept** (without changes)
- b. **To accept with minor changes** (the reviewer states what changes are suggested)
- c. **To revise and resubmit** (the reviewer states what are the necessary revision and suggested changes)
- d. **To reject** (the reviewer states what are the reason of rejection)

The final decision of accepting, revising or rejecting the paper is taken by the editorial board.

It is advisable to authors to see the questions the reviewers answer:

- 1) Does the title of the paper correspond to its content?
- 2) Is the topic interesting for researchers and actual?
- 3) Is the abstract comprehensive and complete? Are aims, methods, main results and conclusions included in the abstract?
- 4) Are the key words and Journal of Economic Literature (JEL) classification selected appropriately?
- 5) Are the aims of the paper original, relevant and stated clearly in the introduction? Does the introduction states the nature and scope of the problem?
- 6) Does the paper refer to the state of the art of the area of research? Is the relationship to previous work made clear?
- 7) Are research questions, hypothesis and assumptions properly formulated? Does the preceding discussion lead to the research questions and hypothesis?
- 8) Does the methodology of the research correspond to the problem? Is the selection of methods appropriate?
- 9) Are the empirical parts of the paper clearly explained? Are the data fully described and their precise sources given? Are statistical results reported in a proper way?

- 10) Do the conclusions correspond to the research and aims of the paper?
- 11) Are the conclusions explicitly stated?
- 12) Does the text bring new findings?
- 13) Are relevant authors cited in the text?
- 14) Are all cited works included in references?
- 15) Are the style and grammar appropriate to a scientific work? Is the style of the author accurate and understandable?
- 16) Is the topic perspective regarding further research? What are the recommendations of the reviewer to further specialization of author(s)?

All the papers are subject to copyediting. The final step before publishing the paper is the author's editing.