

## *Entrepreneurship Journal for Finance and Business*

According to the policy of the **Entrepreneurship Journal for Finance and Business (EJFB)**, a **Double-blind Peer Review** system is applied, where both the author and the reviewer remain anonymous to each other throughout the evaluation process. Below are the guidelines that scientific reviewers should follow to ensure the quality of the peer review process:

### 1. Evaluation Criteria for the Journal

- **Originality and Innovation:** The reviewer should ensure that the research provides a new contribution to the field of business and economics, addresses a topic of significant research value, and does not replicate previous studies.
- **Quality of Analysis:** The methodology used in the research should be carefully reviewed to ensure that the methods of data collection and analysis are appropriate to the research objectives and demonstrate accuracy and reliability.
- **Conclusions and Results:** The reviewer should check whether the conclusions drawn are supported by the data and analysis and ensure that the results are interpreted logically and consistently.
- **Relevance to Current Trends:** The reviewer should verify that the research reflects recent developments in business and economics and contributes to the enrichment of knowledge in the field.

### 2. Confidentiality and Impartiality

- **Confidentiality:** The reviewer must maintain the confidentiality of all submitted papers and is prohibited from sharing any details with external parties.
- **Impartiality:** The reviewer should assess the paper objectively, without being influenced by personal or professional relationships with the author or the institution to which they belong.
- **Avoiding Conflicts of Interest:** If the reviewer has any potential conflicts of interest, they must disclose them immediately to the journal.

### 3. Recommendations and Final Decision

- **Detailed Report:** The reviewer should provide a well-considered report containing constructive comments on the strengths and weaknesses of the paper, helping the author to improve the work.
- **Final Recommendation:** The reviewer should recommend whether the paper should be accepted for publication, accepted with minor or major revisions, or rejected. The recommendation must be supported by clear scientific justification.
- **Adherence to Deadlines:** The reviewer must comply with the deadlines for providing their review to ensure the smooth progression of the process.

### 4. Review Ethics

- **Use of Information:** The reviewer is prohibited from using the information or data contained in the paper for personal or commercial purposes.

- **Respecting Author's Rights:** The reviewer should respect the author's intellectual property and should not interfere with the content of the paper, except in providing constructive feedback to improve it.
- **Maintaining Anonymity of Author and Reviewer:** In the double-blind review system, the identity of the author is confidential, and the reviewer's identity must remain anonymous to the author throughout the review process.

## 5. Responsibilities of the Reviewer Towards the Journal

- **Constructive Engagement:** The reviewer is expected to engage with the submitted papers in a constructive, critical manner, aiming to improve the overall scientific quality of the work.
- **Comprehensive Review:** The reviewer should conduct a thorough review of the paper, focusing on all aspects such as methodology, data, conclusions, and language.

The double-blind peer review process ensures the integrity and objectivity of the scientific evaluation, as the identities of both parties remain unknown to maintain transparency and prevent any external influences that could affect the quality of the review.



### Conflict of Interest Disclosure

In the context of double-blind peer review, reviewers are required to disclose any potential conflicts of interest that could affect the integrity and objectivity of their evaluation. A conflict of interest is any situation where impartiality may be compromised due to personal, professional, or financial relationships with the authors.

Reviewers should immediately inform the journal if they have:

- A close personal relationship with the authors (such as friendships or animosities).
- A professional relationship, such as working at the same institution or collaborating on previous research.
- A financial interest that could be influenced by the publication or rejection of the paper.

If the reviewer has any conflict of interest, they must notify the editorial team prior to reviewing. In cases where a conflict of interest exists, the reviewer may be excluded from the review process to ensure the integrity and objectivity of the evaluation.