

## **Corporate Governance: An International Review (CGIR) Guidelines for Reviewers**

1. **Our Mission:** CGIR seeks to be the premiere scholarly outlet for international corporate governance research that is both rigorously done and relevant to practitioners. Rigorous research builds or tests extant theory. It contains clear definitions of constructs and well-specified relationships. It demonstrates a command of previous literature and is methodologically sound. Relevant research asks research questions that practitioners care about. It addresses real problems which policy-makers are wrestling with. It offers insights to practitioners and/or policy-makers that can assist them in governing corporations better.

2. **Confidentiality Maintained:** Reviewers should respect the confidentiality of the review process. Reviewers should not discuss the manuscript with anyone other than the Editor, nor any information from the manuscript without permission.

3: **Polite Tone with Honest Appraisal:** Reviewers should be polite in tone and friendly to the authors, while being honest about the manuscript's scholarly potential. Reviewers should be sensitive to submissions from authors whose native language is not English, since CGIR, by its nature, attracts submissions from scholars all over the world. Reviewers should not submit corrections for spelling and grammar mistakes, but should instead encourage authors to seek professional editing assistance in rewriting the manuscript.

4. **Developmental Reviews:** Reviewers should provide a developmental review. A developmental review does the following:

- \* Separates the reviewer's comments into "major" and "minor" concerns which helps signal to the author(s) the most important issues with the manuscript;
- \* Identifies both the strengths and the weaknesses of the manuscript so that the author(s) can feel good about its strengths and learn where they can improve;
- \* Is specific about the problems in the manuscript and makes concrete suggestions as to how the problems might be addressed;
- \* Provides an overall assessment of the manuscripts contribution to the field in terms of theoretical and practical implications.

5. **Timeliness:** Reviewers should be prompt with their reviews out of consideration to authors. Normally, our review cycle time will be three weeks. In certain circumstances, an extension can be granted.

6. **Unavailability Period(s):** If you are not available to perform reviews for a period of time greater than three weeks (e.g., extended vacation, health issues), please go to your reviewer account and block out the period of time during which you will be unavailable.

7. **Citations:** Reviewers should be alert to missing citations in the literature. If you believe that key literature has been overlooked, please cite it in your feedback and reference it at the bottom of your review.

8. **Final Decision:** Reviewers often disagree on the ultimate publishability of the manuscript. As such, please do NOT include your overall recommendation in your comments to the author(s). It is the Editor's responsibility to render an editorial decision. The reviewer's editorial opinion should be given only to the editor in a separate, private communication.