

# THE JOURNAL OF BEHAVIOURAL ECONOMICS & SOCIAL SYSTEMS (BESS)

## REVIEWER GUIDELINES

### ARTICLES

Please note that BESS has these goals.

*At The Journal of Behavioural Economics and Social Systems*, we believe in problem solving. When business transcends complicated and becomes truly complex, a new approach is needed. Wicked problems involve social justice, social change, and social economy issues characterised by stakeholder multiplicity and policy confusion. Addressing this difficulty requires the ability to negotiate politically, under conditions of uncertainty, and to work effectively in networks and at the boundaries between academia, industry, and policy. So we try to arm our readers with ideas that help them work in complex social systems acting as agents of economic, social, and policy change; solving problems that are too difficult for the rational-scientific approach. To do that, we enlist leading experts in academia, business and government, collaborating to express their thoughts in the most influential way possible.

Is the paper a good fit with these journal goals?

Yes

No

Don't know

Comments:

1. Originality: Does the paper contain new and significant information adequate to justify publication?

Your comments:

2. Relationship to Literature: Does the paper demonstrate an adequate understanding of the relevant literature in the field and cite an appropriate range of literature sources? Is any significant work ignored?

Your comments:

3. Methodology: Is the paper's argument built on an appropriate base of theory, concepts, or other ideas? Has the research or equivalent intellectual work on which the paper is based been well designed? Are the methods employed appropriate?

Your comments:

4. Results: Are results presented clearly and analysed appropriately? Do the conclusions adequately tie together the other elements of the paper?

Your comments:

5. Implications for research, practice and/or society: Does the paper identify clearly any implications for research, practice and/or society? Does the paper bridge the gap between theory and practice? How can the research be used in practice (economic and commercial impact), in teaching, to influence public policy, in research (contributing to the body of knowledge)? What is the impact upon society (influencing public attitudes, affecting quality of life)? Are these implications consistent with the findings and conclusions of the paper?

Your comments:

6. Quality of Communication: Does the paper clearly express its case, measured against the technical language of the field and the expected knowledge of the journal's readership? Has attention been paid to the clarity of expression and readability, such as sentence structure, jargon use, acronyms, etc.

*Recommendation (Select one)*

1. Accept without changes
2. Minor revisions
3. Major revisions
4. Reject

*Would you be willing to review a revision of this manuscript?*

Yes or No

*Confidential Comments to the Editor-in-Chief*

Please include

*Comments to the Author*

Please include

## Research notes

1. Topic: is the idea clearly explained?

Your comments:

2. Significance: is this important?

Your comments:

3. Innovation: is this new?

Your comments:

4. Relevance: do managers need to know about it?

Your comments:

5. Application: can this idea be applied?

Your comments:

6. Credibility: should we trust this idea? Does it build on previous knowledge or experience?

Your comments:

7. Track record: is there evidence presented?

*Recommendation (Select one)*

1. Accept without changes
2. Minor revisions
3. Major revisions
4. Reject

*Would you be willing to review a revision of this manuscript?*

Yes or No

*Confidential Comments to the Editor-in-Chief*

Please include

*Comments to the Author*

Please include

## Essays

Essays will be reviewed by a member of the editorial board. Comments should be forwarded to the editor-in-chief along these lines:

1. Is the paper interesting?
2. Does the paper fit with the BESS and its aims?
3. Will the BESS readers find the paper idea useful?
4. Is the paper reasonably well written?

*Recommendation (Select one)*

1. Accept without changes
2. Minor revisions
3. Major revisions
4. Reject

*Would you be willing to review a revision of this manuscript?*

Yes or No

*Confidential Comments to the Editor-in-Chief*

Please include

*Comments to the Author*

Please include