

## **Reviewer Guidelines**

---

### **Purpose**

In order to provide high-quality feedback to authors, it is important that all reviewers are aware of the purpose of the *Christian Business Review* as a forum for integrating biblical principles in business as a way of life. The publication is grounded in the belief that “[a]ll Scripture is inspired by God and profitable for teaching, for reproof, for correction, for training in righteousness; so that the man of God may be adequate, equipped for every good work” (2 Tim. 3:16-17).

The *CBR* is concerned with both academic and business communities and views them as complementary to the mission of building a distinctively Christian worldview for business. To that end, we will publish research-based papers drawn from the efforts of academic professionals as well as experience-based articles that reflect the personal insights of business leaders, Christian thinkers, and commentators.

Regardless of format, all papers are expected to derive from an expert point of view, demonstrate a careful study and analysis of the idea or issue, and represent an advance in terms of new development, integration or application. Most importantly, the core message must convey biblical perspectives based on a proper interpretation of the Scriptures with due regard for exegetical and hermeneutic principles.

Both experience-based and research-based articles are accepted by the CBR, but only research-based articles go through an external, double-blind peer review in addition to the review by the editorial board. The following guidelines apply specifically to external peer reviews.

### **Reviewer Comments to the Author(s)**

#### **Specific/Substantive Considerations**

1. Does the article sufficiently address the “practical” implications of the issue for a business practitioner?
2. Does the article sufficiently integrate biblical perspectives in the discussion, not in the manner of casual references but as an integral part of or support for the central theme?
3. Does the author use sound exegesis and proper hermeneutic principles in applying the Scriptures? Is the use of specific Scriptural passages relevant in the argument at hand?
4. Is the article adequately referenced and its methodology/conclusion a definite advance on the current state of discourse or understanding of the subject in the academic realms?

**General Considerations**

1. **Timeliness.** Research-based papers should not exceed 5,000 words in length. Reviewers are requested to complete their reviews and forward their comments within a month from the date they receive the manuscript. If this timeframe cannot be honored, please advise the editors accordingly.
2. Strive for a **polite, professional, constructive** tone.
3. Strive to make the review **developmental**:
  - a. Be specific: tell the author what the problems are and how they can be addressed, where possible
  - b. Be constructive: even if the problems cannot be fixed in the current study, try to suggest how the author(s) could improve their work for a future effort
  - c. Identify strengths: as important as identifying weaknesses; also try to distinguish between limitations that can be fixed versus those that definitely cannot
  - d. Consider contribution: keep in mind both technical as well as substantive criteria; there is no point in publishing a paper that is theoretically sound but that fails to make a meaningful contribution
4. **DO NOT** make a publication recommendation in your comments to the author(s). E.g., "this is an excellent paper that should be accepted."
5. **Cite page numbers** when referring to specific sections of the manuscript.
6. While there is no set guide for the structure of a review, typically reviewers address critical concerns first, followed by less critical points.