BURGAS FREE UNIVERSITY
the new idea in education

BULGARIAN JOURNAL OF BUSINESS RESEARCH

DOI: 10.46656/bposoki

GUIDELINES FOR REVIEWERS

EDITORIAL BOARD

The editorial board is multi-institutional and composed of scientifically and geographically diverse specialists covering different regions and countries. Recruitment, follow-up and eventual replacement of its members is done by the Editor. The members of this Council hold a doctorate and have significant scientific and technical production and practical experience in their area of expertise. External ad hoc evaluators may be invited to issue opinions for possible special thematic editions or when evaluators are not available and don't have the technical knowledge to evaluate a theme.

WHAT REVIEWERS ARE ASKED TO DO

The manuscript should:
• fulfill the format requirements;
• fulfill the plagiarism requirements;
• be written in accordance with the scope of BULGARIAN JOURNAL OF BUSINESS RESEARCH;
• be up-to-date;
• be understandable.
The editors have the right to reject any manuscripts without justification if it does not fit into the policy of "**Bulgarian Journal of Business Research"**.
Reviewers are asked to always be polite and constructive in their report, and never to be abusive or to make unjustified criticisms of the work.

Reviewers will guide their judgment and advice on their assigned submissions taking into account the following assessment guidelines:

1. Title

• Is the title consistent with the main idea of the article?
• Is the title interesting and adequate?

2. General Aspects

• Is there a clear objective for the article (e.g. a clear research question)?
• Is the topic related to the area in which it is inserted?
• Is it relevant to the development of the geographical area of interest?
• Is the purpose of the work adequate?
• Are the study boundaries established?
• Is it an original contribution?

3. Shape and Style

• Is the length acceptable? (maximum of 15 and minimum of 10 pages, respectively)
• Is the organization of the article in sections and subsections adequate? (guidelines for authors in the journal)
• Is the presentation clear, unbiased and non-wordy?
• Is the written text adequate for spelling, syntax, construction of sentences and paragraphs?

DOI: 10.46656/bposoki

• Do the bibliographic references follow the orientation of the journal?
• Are the Tables and Figures configured according to the orientation of the journal? Are tables and figures used efficiently? Do they all have a call in the text?

4. Abstract
• Is the summary clear about the important points and the results of the work?
• Is the length adequate? (maximum of 250 words)
• Are the keywords appropriate?

5. Literature Review
• Is the literature review well organized and is it recent?
• Does the author make suitable references to contain the classic references of the subject in the same area of research?
• Is literature critically examined, representing the state of the art?
• Is the relationship between the current problem and the previous research clear?
• Do you follow the recommendation to use at least 65% of references from articles published in scientific journals?

6. Methodology
• Are the methods and materials used adequate and well presented?
• Are they scientifically presented (allowing the work to be reproduced)?
• Is the methodology compared to those normally used in similar classical works?
• If applicable, are the research tools appropriate, up-to-date and adequately used?
• Is the method of sampling adequate and consistent?

7. Results and Discussion
• Is the report of findings clear and complete (so far as can be determined)?
• Are the methods used in the data analysis applied correctly and properly?
• Do the discussion and conclusions accurately reflect on the findings?
• Does the article represent work effectively concluded with discussion?
• Is the discussion relevant? Is it coherent? Does it show the preparation and knowledge of the author?
• Did the article interest the reviewer?
• Does the article contain reproducible results?
• Are there new results presented in the manuscript?

8. Conclusions
• Are the findings clearly stated?
• Do the research data support the conclusions?
• Are the conclusions relevant to the current state of the art?
• Are generalizations restricted to the sample it was extracted from?
• Is there a conclusion stating the relevance of the results and their implications (strengths)?
• Does the conclusion make suggestions for future studies and have the potential to stimulate further research?

DOI: 10.46656/bposoki

9. Suggested Revisions (General Evaluator Comments) - After review, results can be:

- Accept in present form.
- Accept after minor revision (corrections to minor methodological errors and text editing).
- Requires moderate revision, resubmit for review.
- Reconsider after major revision (control missing in some experiments).
- Reject (article has serious flaws, additional experiments needed, research not conducted correctly).

Plagiarism verification

Manuscripts should specify in comments to the editor in submission, the individual responsibilities of all authors in the preparation work, according to the following template: "Author X is blamed for ...; Author Y was responsible for ...; Author Z was responsible for ..., etc. "