

MARKET AND COMPETITION LAW REVIEWReview Process**1. Review Process:**

The Editorial Board decides, based on the Abstracts submitted, which original articles will be featured in each issue. The Editorial Board may confer with the Scientific Board as part of the decision-making process.

The original articles submitted and accepted for publication are subject to a double-blind peer-review process.

1.1. Peer Review Process – general rules:

- a) The original articles submitted are subject to an independent and anonymous double-blind peer-review process.
- b) In the double-blind peer-review both the reviewer and author identities are concealed from the reviewers, and vice versa, throughout the review process. To facilitate this, authors need to ensure that their manuscripts are prepared in a way that does not give away their identity.
- c) As a result of the review process, authors may be expected to modify their articles according to the recommendations of the reviewers.
- d) The peer review should be completed and the amended articles should be submitted within 7 days and they must be accompanied by the evaluation referred in 1.4. – a) (annex 2), the justification referred in 1.4. – b) (annex 3), the explanation of the changes made and other comments referred in 1.4. – c) (annex 4) and the recommendation referred in 1.4. – d) (annex 5).
- e) The articles with the modifications should be submitted by the author within 7 days.
- f) The decision to publish, to return an articles for modifications or to reject the articles belongs to the editors.
- g) Authors of published articles do not receive royalty fees.
- h) The costs of the peer-review process or publication are supported by the editors.

1.2. The reviewers:

The reviewers are selected by the editorial board for their recognized merit in the area to which the article belongs.

1.3. Specific rules for the reviewers

The reviewers should observe the following rules:

- a) The reviewers will score the articles according to the criteria referred on 1.4.
- b) All the annexes of the peer-review should be written in English.
- c) The peer-review should be completed by the reviewers and submitted within 7 days.
- d) The articles submitted must be treated as confidential until their publication.
- e) The critics must be justified with the quotation from the articles.
- f) The reviewers should notify the editors in case of suspect of plagiarism or any conflict of interest.
- g) The ratings, recommendations and comments will be shared with the author of the article.

1.4. Guidelines for the reviewers on the peer-review process

The reviewers should observe the following guidelines on the peer-review process:

- a) The reviewers should score 8 items from 0 to 10 (annex 2).
- b) If the score, for any criteria, is lower than 8, the reviewers should justify their evaluation (annex 3).
- c) The reviewers should explain the modifications made and the suggestions and they also can present other comments on the annex 4.
- d) The recommendation should be made according to the annex 5.
- e) The score ranges:
 - Accept: between 60 points – 80 points.
 - Accept whit minor modifications: 48 points – 60 points.
 - Accept after major reformulation: 32 points- 48 points.
 - Reject: under 32 points.

ANNEX 1 – IDENTIFICATION OF THE REVIEWER AND THE ARTICLE

Identification of the Reviewer

Name and Surname: _____

E-mail: _____

Occupation and Institution: _____

Identification of the article:

Title: _____

ANNEX 2 – EVALUATION CRITERIA

Evaluation Criteria	Score (0 to 10)
1. Contribution/ relevance of the subject	
2. Analysis of the current literature	
3. Analysis of the current jurisprudential support	
4. Use of current theories or concepts in the field	
5. Development of current theories or concepts in the field	
6. Quality and logic consistency of the critical analysis	
7. Clarity and logical of the conclusions	
8. Quality and textual organization of the article submitted	
Total Score (0-80)	

ANNEX 3 – JUSTIFICATION OF THE SCORE LOWER THAN 8 FOR ANY CRITERIA

Score Justification

ANNEX 4 – RECOMMENDATION

After the final evaluation, my recommendation is (choose only one option):

1. Accept.
2. Accept with minor modifications.
3. Accept after major reformulation.
4. Reject.

ANNEX 5 - EXPLANATION OF THE CHANGES MADE AND OTHER COMMENTS

Explanation of the changes made and comments