

REVIEWING GUIDELINES

- **Invitation to review**

You will receive invitation letter from Editor to review the paper.

You will have one week to decide if you are able to review the article or not, and one more week do the review itself.

To accept/decline review, log in into the ECT system – ect-journals.rtu.lv/.

There are 5 steps for reviewing:

- 1) Before reviewing the paper, accept paper if you feel confident in this research area, if not – decline it. If you are able to review click “Will do the review”, if not – Unable to do the review.
- 2) Use this guideline for better understanding the reviewing process.
- 3) Reviewing paper will appear, as well as supplementary files (if attached).
- 4) Fill in the reviewing form by taking account following aspects:

The main factors you should provide advice on as a reviewer are the originality, presentation, relevance, and significance of the manuscript’s subject matter to the readership of the journal.

- **Try to have the following questions in mind while you are reading the manuscript**

- ✓ Does the topic of the paper corresponds with journal topics?
- ✓ What is the importance of the topic?
- ✓ Does this paper show scientific evaluation?
- ✓ Is the paper well structured (paper should contain abstract, introduction, methodology, results, conclusions and references)?
- ✓ Are all the figures and tables appropriate, understandable and necessary?
- ✓ Are there any grammatical errors?
- ✓ Are references adequate in number and quality?

- **Other aspects to consider**

Abstract – Has this been provided (if required)? Does it adequately summarize the key findings/approach of the paper?

Keywords – Keywords can not overlap with the title or terms in title.

Presentation – Is the writing style clear and appropriate to the readership? Are any tables or graphics clear to read and labelled appropriately?

References – Does the paper contain the appropriate referencing to provide adequate context for the present work, e.g., the amount, up to date, scientific type of references (scientific journals, conferences, etc.).

Figures – the quality of figures should be at least 250 dpi, as well they should be clear and understandable.

Please note that if you want to re-review paper yourself after author's revision, please, write it in the last box (confidential information to Editor) of the review form.

- **Give your recommendation**

Once you've read the paper and have assessed its quality, you need to make a recommendation to the editor regarding publication. The decision types are:

- **Accept** – if the paper is suitable for publication in its current form.
- **Revisions required** – paper needs to be improved by Reviewer's comments.
- **Reject** – if the paper is not suitable for publication with this journal or if the revisions that would need to be undertaken are too fundamental for the submission to continue being considered in its current form.

These are some examples that can be used for reviewing:

Positive comments

- *The manuscript is well-written in an engaging and lively style.*
- *The level is appropriate to our readership.*
- *The subject is very important. It is currently something of a “hot topic,” and it is one to which the author(s) have made significant contributions.*
- *This manuscript ticks all the boxes we normally have in mind for an X paper, and I have no hesitation in recommending that it be accepted for publication after a few typos and other minor details have been attended to.*
- *Given the complexity involved, the author has produced a number of positive and welcome outcomes including the literature review which offers a useful overview of current research and policy and the resulting bibliography which provides a very useful resource for current practitioners.*
- *This is a well-written article that does identify an important gap.*

When constructive criticism is required

- *In the “Discussion” section I would have wished to see more information on...*
- *Overall I do not think that this article contains enough robust data to evidence the statement made on page X, lines Y–Z.*
- *I would strongly advise the author(s) of this paper to rewrite their introduction, analysis, and discussion to produce a more contextualized introduction to...*
- *There is an interesting finding in this research about However, there is insufficient discussion of exactly what this finding means and what its implications are.*
- *This discussion could be enlarged to explain...*
- *The authors could strengthen the paper by...*
- *The paper would be significantly improved with the addition of more details about...*
- *The abstract is very lengthy and goes into detailed accounts that are best suited for the article’s main discussion sections. As such, it is suggested the section is reduced in size and that only the most important elements remain.*
- *To make this paper publishable the author needs to respond to the following substantive points...*

When linguistic alterations are required

- *This paper would benefit from some closer proof reading. It includes numerous linguistic errors (e.g. agreement of verbs) that at times make it difficult to follow. I would suggest that it may be useful to engage a professional English language editor following a restructure of the paper.*
- *The paper is to benefit from making stylistic changes in the way it has been written to make a stronger, clearer, and more compelling argumentative case.*
- *There are a few sentences that require rephrasing for clarity.*