FrancoAngeli s.r.l.

Theory and Practice in Accounting, Auditing and Risk management

REVIEW PROCEDURE

www.francoangeli.it - **Sede legale**: viale Monza 106, 20127 Milano. *e-mail:* redazioni@francoangeli.it - Tel. 02 2837141 r.a. - Fax direzione e redazione: 02 26144793; Vendite: 02 26141958; Amministrazione: 02 2613268. **Sede Redazione Roma**: via Savoia 80, 00198 Roma. *e-mail*: redazione.roma@francoangeli.it - Tel. 06 8416483; 06 8414425; Fax 06 8542389. C.F. e P.I. 04949880159 – Iscr. Registro imprese Milano (MI146-204170) Iscritta REA Mi. 1071365. Capitale sociale 40.000.000.

REVIEW PROCEDURE

Editors select publishing proposals. If publishing proposal are suitable for the series, they are sent to a minimum of two independent referees for double blind peer review.

Editors are responsible for the final decision regarding acceptance or rejection of publishing proposal. The Editors' decision is final.

Publishing acceptance procedure of publishing proposals requires:

- Email submission to Editors,
- Positive acceptance by the Editors with the support of Editorial Board,
- Publishing proposals with a positive acceptance are sent to reviewers,
- Publishing proposals with a negative acceptance are rejected or revised and resubmitted. Editors with the support of Editorial Board take the final decision.

Authors are notified on the publishing acceptance or rejection.

After the publishing acceptance of book proposals the Editorial Board assists the Editors in selecting the reviewers. The members of the Editorial Board can contribute as reviewers. In this case, the members of the Editorial Board cannot be involved in the review process.

The review process of the full text takes no more than 6 weeks. The reviewers use an evaluation form for making their comments and recommendation.

The reviewers send their evaluation to the Editors. The following events can occur:

- If the recommendation of both reviewers is "acceptance", the book is published under the final decision of the Editors with the support of the Editorial Board.
- If the recommendation of both reviewers is "rejection", the book is not published under the final decision of rejection of the Editors with the support of the Editorial Board.
- If the recommendation of one reviewer is "rejection", the Editors with the support of the Editorial Board decide if to select a third reviewer or to reject the book.
- If the evaluation of both reviewers is "revised and resubmitted, with major or minor revisions", the book is sent again to the authors. Authors are required to make their revision within one month. Once the book is revised, it is sent again to reviewers.

Authors receive the evaluation form of both reviewers when any of the above event occurs.

Each reviewer use an evaluation form for making their comments and recommendation on the books. The evaluation form is sent to the Editors, and then to the Authors.

1. Originality (20 points): Does the book present a significant and new contribution to the relation between academic research and professional practice by exploring trends, paradigms and perspectives in accounting, auditing and risk management? Is it adequate to justify publication? (Please report your comments and points)
2. Relationship to theory and practice (20 points): Does the book demonstrate an adequate understanding of the relevant literature and professional practice in the field? Does it mention an appropriate range of literature and practical sources? Is any significant work ignored? (Please report your comments and points)
3. Methodology (20 points): Is the aim of the book developed with an appropriate theoretical/practical base? Is the research well designed? Are the methods applied appropriate? (Please report your comments and points)
4. Results (20 points): Are results presented clearly and analyzed appropriately? Are the conclusions properly related to the other chapters of the book? (Please report your comments and points)
5. Implications for research and practice (20 points): Does the book identify clearly any implications for research and practice? Does it reduce the gap between theory and practice? How can the research/practice be used in practice/research in accounting, auditing and risk management? Does it contribute to a dialogue between academics and practitioners? Are these implications consistent with the findings and conclusions of the book? (Please report your comments and points)
Additional comments to the Authors:
Recommendations: • Acceptance (100 points) • Revised and resubmit, with minor revisions (70-99 points) • Revised and resubmit, with major revisions (40-69 points) • Rejection (0-39 points) *Reviewer recommendation:* (Please report your recommendation and total points)
Additional comments to the Editors (confidential):