

# BASIQ International Conference on New Trends in Sustainable Business and Consumption

## - Peer review guide -

The BASIQ International Conference on New Trends in Sustainable Business and Consumption employs a rigorous double-blind peer review process to ensure the scientific quality, originality and academic integrity of all submitted articles. Each manuscript is independently evaluated by a minimum of two qualified reviewers from relevant academic disciplines. The present guide establishes uniform evaluation criteria and procedures for all reviewers. Adherence to these guidelines ensures consistency, fairness and transparency across the review process. Reviewers are kindly asked to follow the present guidelines.

### **1. Ethical obligations of the reviewer**

Before accepting a review assignment, the reviewer must confirm compliance with the following ethical requirements:

- Confidentiality: The manuscript, its content and all associated review materials must be treated as strictly confidential. The reviewer must not share, disclose or discuss the manuscript with third parties, nor it should be handled using any Artificial Intelligence tools.
- Impartiality: The evaluation must be based solely on the scientific merit of the work.
- Timeliness: Reviews must be submitted within the deadline communicated by the editorial team. In the event of unforeseen circumstances, the reviewer must promptly notify the editors.
- Non-appropriation: Reviewers must not make use of unpublished ideas, results, or data from the manuscript under review without the explicit written consent of the authors.

### **2. Scientific evaluation criteria**

Reviewers must assess each of the following dimensions critically and provide substantiated written observations for each criterion where deficiencies are identified.

#### ***Introduction***

The introduction should position the research within the relevant academic literature and identify the research gap addressed by the article. This should also include a minimum of 3 peer-reviewed scientific references that document prior research in the field. Also, it should formulate a clear and specific research question, objective, or hypothesis.

#### ***Review of the scientific literature***

A section dedicated to the acknowledgement of previous works in the field should be included in the paper. At the minimum, coherence between the cited works and the approached topic should be ensured.

#### ***Research methodology***

A dedicated methodology section is mandatory. This should address, at the minimum, the research design and the data sources and instruments. The type of research employed must be explicitly stated and the collection tools, sample characteristics (where applicable), collection process should be outlined.

#### ***Results***

The results section must present the empirical or analytical findings clearly and systematically.

#### ***Discussions***

The discussion section must interpret the results in light of the existing literature, demonstrating how the findings confirm, challenge, or extend prior knowledge.

#### ***Conclusions***

The conclusions section is mandatory and it should summarize the main contributions of the research.

#### ***References and citations***

The quality and rigor of the reference system is an integral part of the scientific evaluation. The reviewer should assess the strict adherence to the APA referencing style throughout the article (in-text citations and reference list) and check for consistency between in-text citations and the reference list

### 3. Editorial decision

Based on the evaluation, the reviewer must recommend one of the following decisions:

<b>Accepted without revision</b>	The manuscript meets all formal and scientific requirements. Minor typographical or stylistic revisions may be suggested but do not require a new review cycle.
<b>Minor Revision</b>	The manuscript has scientific merit but presents limited deficiencies that can be corrected by the authors without substantially altering the structure or argument of the article (e.g., incomplete abstract, insufficient keywords, minor referencing errors, clarity improvements).
<b>Major Revision</b>	The manuscript presents significant scientific or structural weaknesses requiring substantial rewriting. This includes: absence of a methodology section, insufficient literature review, results not aligned with stated objectives, or conclusions absent/non-compliant.
<b>Rejected</b>	The manuscript does not meet the minimum scientific standards of the conference, presents fundamental methodological flaws, lacks originality, or is outside the scope of the conference. Rejection is also recommended in cases of suspected plagiarism or academic misconduct.

### 4. Peer review grid

Reviewers are kindly asked to provide their assessment following the peer review grid bellow.

## PEER REVIEW GRID

**Manuscript ID:**

**Title:**

**DECISION:**

- Accepted without revision
- Minor revision
- Major revision
- Rejected

**Please, rate based on the following scale (1 – worst, 5 – best) the quality of the below criteria:**

	1	2	3	4	5
Abstract completeness: <i>All 5 required elements present, clearly articulated, and consistent with article content.</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Purpose: A clear statement of the research objective or problem addressed.</i></li> <li>• <i>Methodology: A concise description of the research methods employed.</i></li> <li>• <i>Main results: The principal findings or outcomes of the research.</i></li> <li>• <i>Degree of originality/novelty: An explicit articulation of the contribution to the field.</i></li> <li>• <i>Practical implications: Where applicable, the potential real-world applications or policy relevance of the findings.</i></li> </ul>					
Introduction <i>- minimum 3 peer-reviewed sources cited;</i> <i>- research gap identified;</i> <i>- research question/objective stated.</i>					
Literature review <i>- coherence between the approached topic and the cited literature.</i>					
Methodology <i>- appropriate method selected;</i> <i>- data sources and instruments clearly described.</i>					
Results <i>- findings clearly presented;</i> <i>- consistent with stated objectives;</i> <i>- tables/figures properly labeled.</i>					
Discussion <i>- results interpreted in light of literature.</i>					
Conclusions <i>- brief synthesis of the results.</i>					
Formal compliance <i>- template, page limit (max. 8);</i> <i>- keywords (4–7);</i> <i>- APA references.</i>					
Overall writing quality <i>clarity, coherence, academic register, logical structure of the article.</i>					

**Comments to editor:**

**Comments to authors:**