

REVIEW POLICIES

- JEI does not reveal the identity of reviewers to author(s), and takes care to mask any identifying marks on reviews to maintain the reviewers' anonymity.
- The first responsibility of peer reviewers is to respond by the date indicated within the message accompanying the manuscript. If you are unable to review or return the manuscript by that date, please notify the editorial office as soon as possible so that the manuscript can be sent out to another reviewer without delay.
- The unpublished manuscript is a privileged document. Please protect it from any form of exploitation. Reviewers are expected not to cite a manuscript or refer to the work it describes before it has been published, and to refrain from using the information it contains for the advancement of their own research.
- If you believe that you cannot judge a given article impartially, please advise the editorial office immediately with that explanation.
- In comments intended for the author's, criticism should be presented dispassionately, and abrasive remarks avoided.
- Even if we do not accept a paper, we still would like to pass on constructive comments that might help the author(s) to improve it. Please give detailed comments that will help both the editors to make a decision on the paper and the authors to improve it.
- You are not requested to correct mistakes in grammar, but any help in this regard will be appreciated.
- The editors gratefully receive reviewer's recommendations. However, a reviewer should not expect the editors to honor his or her every recommendation since the editorial decisions are usually based on evaluations derived from several sources.
- An official letter of appreciation from the Editor-in-Chief will be mailed to the reviewer after the review is received.

EVALUATION CRITERIA

- In your review, please consider the following aspects as you evaluate the overall quality of the manuscript.
- **IMPORTANCE**
Is the content important to the relevant field and of interest to the journal's readers?
 - **ORIGINALITY**
Does the paper present new, innovative or insightful information? Does it reflect current information on this topic?

- **CLARITY**
Is the purpose of the paper apparent or stated in the introductory section? Are any areas vague or difficult to understand? Are there any contradictions or inconsistencies? Does the paper stay focused?
- **ORGANIZATION**
Are ideas developed and related in a logic sequence? Are transitions between discussions smooth and easy to follow? Is the content consistent with the purpose of the paper?
- **ACCURACY**
Is any information in the paper inaccurate? Are interpretations and conclusions sound? Has the author accurately characterized what referenced literature relates? Do math or text errors appear in figures or tables?
- **Methodology**
Appropriateness of approach or experimental design, adequacy of analytic or experimental techniques. Methods adequately described? Appropriate?
- **Results**
Results relevant to problem posed? Credible? Well presented? Relevance of the figures and table, clarity of legends and titles.
- **Interpretation**
Soundness of discussion and conclusions. Interpretation and conclusions warranted by the data? Reasonable speculation?
- **REFERENCES**
Do the references represent authoritative sources of information? Have the most current references on this topic been included?

REVIEW FORM

- The review form covers all the information required from a reviewer for the editors to evaluate the manuscript. It contains five parts.
1. Reviewer and manuscript Information
 2. Categorized ratings of the manuscript Reviewers are required to rate the manuscript in several categories corresponding to the evaluation criteria. The levels of rating are Excellent, Good, Fair, Poor, and Very Poor.
 3. Overall recommendation
Indicate your recommendation by choosing one of the following:
 - Accept without revision: The paper is ready for publication.
 - Accept with minor revisions: The paper requires only simple revisions that could be accomplished within short period of time.
 - Accept with major revisions: More extensive revisions are required (such as rethinking interpretations of the

- data, finding and incorporating missed references into the narrative, rethinking the structure and presentation of data tables, adding illustrations, etc.). This category of acceptance would require substantial amount of time for revisions to be completed.
- Reject but may resubmit: The topic and basic approach of the analysis or experiment are appropriate to JEI, but some of the work needs to be redone, or additional works need to be incorporated. Note that "Reject may resubmit" does NOT mean that the paper is unsuitable for JEI, nor is it a negative response. It simply means that the requested revisions will probably require significant amount of work. If you choose this option, emphasize in your comments that the author is, in fact, encouraged to resubmit the article and that the recommendation is not a negative one, but rather one which will allow more time for revisions.
- Reject: The paper is unsuitable for JEI. If you have ideas for a more appropriate venue, please feel free to mention them for the author's benefit.
- 4. Comments to the editors
Used to give confidential comments that will not be forwarded to the author.
- 5. Comments to the author(s)
For reviewers to offer comments that will be forwarded to the author. Please do not make any specific statement about acceptability of the paper in this part.

SUBMISSION OF FORM

- Reviewers can feel free to use one of the three ways to submit review forms to the editors. The receipt of a review will be acknowledged in 24 hours via email. The reviewer will receive a letter of acknowledgement and appreciation from the editors.
- Online review form
Reviewers are welcome to use the online review form.
 - Email attachment
Reviewers can download the review form in Word format, and type your comments in the form, then email it back to the editorial office as attachment.
 - By Fax
Reviewers may also fax completed forms back to the editorial office.

JEI Editorial Office
4246 Albert Street, Suite 413
Regina, SK S4S 3R9, Canada
Email: jei@iseis.org
Fax: (306) 337-2305

Thank you for your support to JEI.