REVIEW OF INNOVATION AND COMPETITIVENESS

A JOURNAL OF ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL RESEARCH

GIUDE FOR REVIWERS

INTRODUCTION

The Journal Scope regards to both theoretical and applied research, and is not tied to any particular strand of theory, academic discipline, or subject of research in the field of economic science investigating economics of innovation and competitiveness. Papers regarding review of most important technical, socio-economic factors driving information technology industries are very welcome, as well as any contributions to explaining what is happening in the race for global innovation advantage, explaining economic decline in the most developed economies of the 21st century, change and dynamics in the innovation and innovation polices worldwide, building innovation advantage in order to overcome barriers to innovation.

BEFORE YOU BEGIN

Ethics in publishing. Peer - reviewed process is a cornerstone of the current academic community. It reflects the quality of the papers and their authors' knowledge. Peer-reviewed articles support and embody the scientific method. So, it is important to agree regarding the standards of expected ethics in publishing.

Duties of authors: originality of submitted paper, authorship of submitted paper, acknowledgement of sources, avoid disclosure and conflicts of interest (including any financial, personal or other relationships that could inappropriately influence, or be perceived to negatively influence other persons or organizations), avoid fundamental errors in papers, avoid multiple/ concurrent submissions and publications, respect reporting standards.

Duties of reviewers: contribution to editorial decision, check the originality of the paper, check the quality of the paper, submit quality and useful comments for authors, objectivity, confidentiality, avoid the conflict of interest. Reviewers are the main pillar of the peer – review process and their evaluations ensure quality of the published articles. The reviewer must not accept the review process for a certain article it there is a conflict of interest. If the reviewer finds a case of plagiarism should report it.

Duties of editors: making fair publication decision, assigning reviewers, promptly notify the authors on reviewer's opinion, involvement in final paper publication adjustments but not more than 10% of the submitted paper, confidentiality.

DOUBLE - BLIND PEER REVIEW

Review of Innovation and Competitiveness uses double-blind review, which means that the identities of the authors are concealed from the reviewers, and vice versa.

After paper submission, and check if the paper fits the Journal scope, editors or managing editor choose reviewers who match the scientific interest or expertize necessary for reviewing a certain paper. After receiving review report, managing editor sends the comments to the authors in order to improve their paper. Improved paper is sent back to reviewers to check if the paper has been improved enough to be published.

EVALUATION

The review form requires evaluation regarding overall paper quality, evaluation regarding specific criteria and determining paper category. Overall and specific criteria can be graded from 1 to 5 (5 - Excellent; 4 – Good; 3 – Average; 2 - Below average; 1 - Poor). Reviewers can use guidelines below as a help to determine the grade for each criterion.

EVALUATION REGARDING SPECIFIC CRITERIA

Abstract. Does abstract introduces the reader to the topic? Does it reflect the main goal of research? Does the abstract suggest theoretical or empirical importance, brief description of methodology, and main findings and/ or contributions to the field? Does the abstract motivate the reader to read the full paper? The abstract should contain up to 500 words.

Article structure. We encourage "Your Paper - Your Way" system, which enables the authors to choose any structure they find fit to properly represent their research in the article. There are differences between quantitative and qualitative papers, as well as between reviews, preliminary papers and original research papers. However, authors should still comply basic requirements of a scientific paper: offer solid theoretical background, state hypothesis and/ or paper goal, explain the choice and use of the methodology, state results, discuss results and their impact on theoretical background, as well as possible applications; not necessarily in that order. Of course, the article should begin with an introduction and end with a conclusion (regarding the content, not chapter title).

Introduction. Does the introduction provide sufficient background information for readers in the immediate field to understand the problem/hypotheses? Is there motivation for conducting this research clearly defined (what are the reasons the reader should continue reading)? Are there indicated most important gaps, inconsistencies or controversies in current literature? What is the theme popularity? Are the study objectives clearly defined (core research question, specific research objectives or clarity of hypothesis context of the research, sample and units of analysis)?

Literature review. Have the authors used most appropriate literature on a specific topic? Have they managed the information and presented it in logical, synthesized and reader-friendly review? Is the literature cited relevant and

balanced, or are there important studies not cited? Please identify if there are missing any citations. Is the literature used up to date?

Soundness and appropriateness of methodology. Are the methods used appropriate to the aims of the study? Is sufficient information provided for a capable researcher to reproduce the procedure described? Are any additional experiments/ surveys/source/ other method required to validate the results of those that were performed? Are appropriate references cited where previously established methods are used? Are there clearly stated sampling (description of the target population, target size, research context, units, respondent profile), data collection (used methods) and measures (units, procedure)?

Results and legitimacy of conclusions. Are the results clearly explained and presented in an appropriate format? Do the figures and tables show essential data or are there any that could easily be summarized in the text? Are any of the data duplicated in the graphics and/or text? Are the figures and tables easy to interpret? Are there any additional graphics that would add clarity to the text? Have appropriate statistical methods been used to test the significance of the results?

Discussion. Do findings align with the study main purpose? Do they confirm the importance of conducting the study? Are all possible interpretations of the dana considered or are there alternative hypotheses that are consistent with the available data? Are the findings properly described in the context of the published literature? Are the limitations of the study discussed? If not, what are the major limitations that

should be discussed? Is there a discussion of practical and theoretical implications? Is there need for further research of the topic?

Conclusions. What is the contribution to the field? Are the conclusions of the study supported by appropriate evidence or are the claims exaggerated?

Title adequacy. Title should be as specific as possible, contain maximum of 8 – 15 words, attract reader's attention (but not too clever, cute or misleading titles). Title should preferably reflect what will be researched, how will the topic be researched, in what context and which sample.

In general, Is the article easily read, is there clarity of writing?

GRADING OVERALL PAPER QUALITY

Excellent, accept as is (5) – the paper is well prepared, no changes are required and can be published as it is

Good, accept with minor revisions (4) – The paper is good, but requires some smaller improvements (up to 10% change of the paper, or up to one-day workload)

Acceptable, revisions required (3) – The paper can be published after extensive improvements (up to 20% change of the paper, or up to one - week workload)

Encourage resubmission after the work is more developed (2) – The paper goal is worth pursuing, but the paper requires change in methods or serious development in order to be published (up to 50% change of the paper)

Reject (1) – the paper does not introduce any new empirical or theoretical research/ research question or paper aim/methods/ approach/ conclusions and represents no contribution to the field.

CHOOSING A PAPER CATEGORY

RIC publishes only scientific papers which can be divided in following categories.

Original scientific paper – original research, primary research. Includes hypothesis, theoretical framework, methods and methodology applied, results and interpretation of findings, and a discussion of possible implications and implications. Original research articles are long, with the usual word limit ranging from 3000 to 6000, and can even go up to 12000 words if necessary.

Preliminary paper – includes forming a theoretical background, appropriate methodology and proposes a new theoretical framework, method, study, hypothesis deduction or experiment proposal, which yet has to be tested or empirically proved. Scientists use it as a preliminary research for extensive future empirical research.

Review - A review article is an article that summarizes the current state of understanding on a topic. A review article surveys, summarizes and discusses previously published studies, and does not offer new facts or analysis. Review article must hold for logical structure and descriptive methodology. The review can be: narrative and explain the findings from existing available literature; systematic and answer a particular question regarding a certain topic; meta-analysis which combines first two and is usually used as an auxiliary research (for deducing or proving auxiliary hypothesis for future original research).