pbs Prague Business School **Centre for Energy Studies**

Guidance for reviewers of the CES Working Paper series

Dear Reviewer,

We would like to thank you for agreeing to act as a reviewer for the CES working paper series. Reviewing an CES Working Paper should involve considerably less work than refereeing a manuscript for a journal and is not meant to be a cumbersome task and should take no more than 2-3 hours of your time to complete.

The purpose of the review is to ensure that the WP is acceptable as a publication of CES, it does not require you provide comments to sufficient level of detail that it should immediately be accepted by a journal. The aim is that you should be able to submit your review within 3-4 weeks – and that short deadline should indicate that we are not requesting a detailed critical assessment but a swift quality check to make sure that acceptable papers can be published online. The vast majority of WPs will go on to be submitted to leading journals and go through a full editorial process. Many WPs will already have been reviewed by one or more colleagues. We therefore do not seek to reproduce a journal's editorial process -- our task for the WP series is instead to facilitate the writing and speedy dissemination of WPs.

The first task of the referee is to quickly check that text and figures are clear. The paper should have been proofread, the language is standard English (either British or American English), and the figures are easily understandable. Usually, we will have a quick review ourselves but if you do not feel the draft paper is sufficiently intelligible then please do not hesitate to return the paper immediately with a list of things to correct – e.g. proofread and spell check, find a copy-editor who can turn it into English, etc.

If the paper passes the first test, then we ask you to quickly read through the paper and determine whether:

- The core idea(s), method(s), analysis and results are clearly stated and presented
- The logic and organisation of the paper are clear
- The paper provides a useful contribution to the field

If the paper meets this standard of acceptability, even if it could be considerably improved, then you should not hesitate to return your review saying so. If you wish to provide more elaborate suggestions, feel free to do so, provided it does not delay the receipt of your review. If you think it meets the standard of acceptability but could be improved and wanted to send comments at a later date, then the paper can be published on our website based on your first confirmation and subsequently revised, with an indication that further comments have been sent to the author and taken into account in the revision.

If you cannot turn the paper around within one week, please let the editor know immediately. In case you can manage it within 3-4 weeks, the editor may agree to accept a slight delay, otherwise we can move on to the next referee and we hope that we might be able to call on you at a future date when you have better availability.

Thanks for your continued support for the CES Working Paper series!