

## **Submissions' Requirements**

If a paper is submitted as group work, it is understood that all listed authors have agreed to its contents and authorized one of them as the corresponding (submitting) author. The corresponding author will communicate with the Journal and act on behalf of the other co-authors in all matters pertaining to the publication of the manuscript.

IJME accepts the following submissions:

- empirical papers
- conceptual papers
- in-depth literature reviews (bibliometric papers).

Submission should consist of two files:

- Cover page
- Article proposition, without author(s) name(s).

Cover page should include:

1. Paper's title.
2. Author/authors' information (information on each author if more than one):
  - a. author's first name (s)
  - b. author's last name
  - c. author's affiliation- institution name and address
  - d. author's e-mail address

*Author(s) affiliations and e-mail addresses will be made available in the published articles.*

3. Corresponding author suggestion (if paper submitted by more than one person)

Submissions should be addressed to: [ijme@sgh.waw.pl](mailto:ijme@sgh.waw.pl)

## Basic editing requirements:

1. The length of the manuscript should be between 15 and 25 pages including abstract, endnotes and references.
2. The paper should be submitted as a Word document. Please use Times New Roman 12-point type, 1.5 spacing. Manuscript should be left-aligned with 0.6 inch paragraph indentations. Only bold fonts ought to be used for highlighting section headings.
3. Figures should be prepared in one of the following programs: CorelDraw, Illustrator or Excel. They should be saved as vector graphics with a possibility to make corrections or send as an attachment to the paper along with the source data. All figures should be plotted in black and white or grey.
4. Table formatting should be limited to the essential minimum.
5. Regarding references, we suggest the use of the Harvard System to indicate authors cited in the text [name, year] – square brackets. In particular, they should be formatted as follows:
  - a. in the case of citation: [Dunning, 2002, p. 15], or: according to Dunning [2002, p. 15]
  - b. in all other cases: according to Dunning [2002].
6. Use endnotes (we name them Notes) instead of footnotes. Use Times New Roman 10-point type, 1.0 spacing and place them before references.
7. Examples of correct style for references (Times New Roman 10-point type, 1.0 spacing listed at the end of the manuscript):

Dunning, J.H., Lundan, S. (2008), *Multinational enterprises and the global economy*, Edward Elgar, Cheltenham.

Johnson, A., Mattsson, L.G. (1993), Internationalization of industrial systems – a network approach, in: P.J. Buckley, P. Ghauri, (Eds), *The internationalization of the firm*, A Reader Academic Press, London, pp. 303-322.

Lindbeck, A., Snower, D. (2001), Insiders versus outsiders, *The Journal of Economic Perspective*, Vol. 15, No. 1, pp. 165-188.

We ask the authors to start their paper with an **ABSTRACT** of approximately 150 words in length indicating:

- paper's objectives
- design/methods applied/approach used (how the objectives were attained)
- findings (the major results of the research)
- originality/value (what new contribution is offered to the existing body of knowledge)
- key words
- JEL classification code.

### **Body of the paper**

The introduction should clearly specify the objective of the paper and the research approach employed. The literature review section should only contain the items that have a direct bearing on the topic being addressed. The discussion section ought to present the authors' research results in the context of relevant previous works of science. We expect papers to end with the conclusions summarizing the key findings and their academic and practical implications.

### **The Reviewing Process**

All submitted manuscripts are read by the editorial staff and Academic Board members. Only manuscripts which meet our editorial criteria are sent to referees for a formal review. Usually we seek advice from two independent referees, whose affiliations are different than the author's/authors'. Sometimes a third referee is included if an extra expertise is needed in cases where one reviewer alone opposes the publication. IJME employs a double-blind peer review process. Peer review is designed to select technically correct research of substance and eliminate frauds. It is editors' and Academic Board experience that the peer review process is an essential part of the publication process, which improves the manuscripts by enhancing their logic, internal consistency and readability.

Authors remain anonymous to the referees throughout the consideration process. We do not release reviewers' identities to authors or to other reviewers.

Based on the received reviews the editors together with Academic Board members make decisions concerning each submission, so decisions are not made by referees, but by editors. The reviewing process could end with one of the four outcomes:

- Accepting as it is, possibly with some minor revisions
- Postponing the final decision and suggesting the authors to revise certain aspects of their manuscripts.
- Rejecting, but indicating the possibility of a resubmission after the additional work is undertaken by the authors.
- Rejecting outright.

Editorial decisions do not always follow the majority recommendation. We try to fully analyze information on which a decision should be based and evaluate the strength of the arguments of all parties involved. We take reviewers' criticisms seriously and occasionally, we ask reviewers for follow-up advice.

## **Reviewers and Reviews**

We select our reviewers on the grounds of their expertise and academic reputation. Reviewers are asked to advise the editors as to what decision ought to be taken, but the most helpful reviews also provide the editors with detailed arguments supporting the specific recommendation. In the case when the reviewer considers the manuscript unacceptable but promising, he/she is expected to propose adjustments which should be introduced to make it acceptable. So even a critical review is valuable in the sense that it enables the author to understand the manuscript's weaknesses and mistakes, and correct it accordingly for resubmission.

We expect reviewers to deliver their report within the number of days specified in the referee form (usually 2 weeks). If reviewers anticipate a delay, we kindly ask them to inform us as soon as it becomes evident.

The reviewers are requested to keep submitted manuscripts confidential and not to redistribute them in any way, shape, or form. This supports our efforts to keep the content of all submissions confidential until the publication date.

We appreciate the time and effort that reviewers devote to assessing the received manuscripts. We consider their work absolutely crucial for ensuring the publications' high standards. We are very grateful for their cooperation and support.