

INSTRUCTIONS FOR REFEREES

Please react very quickly to the first draft. Your report should be sent both Anil Shamdasani at CEPR (ashamdasani@cepr.org) and to the Managing Editor in charge of the paper. The key issues at the stage of refereeing are:

- 1 - **Quality:** An assessment of whether the paper shows sufficient promise to pursue the editorial process. Outright rejection of papers is possible at all stages of the editorial process, and please do not hesitate to recommend it if your reading and comments indicate that there is no promise of a high quality paper in the time available for revision. Of the papers commissioned for presentation at any one panel meeting, it is common for one or two not to reach the first draft stage, for a further one or two not to be accepted for panel presentation, and for one or two to be rejected after panel presentation. If the paper has been submitted to you, however, this is a sign that the editors found the paper's idea and scope interesting at the proposal stage (commissioned proposals already represent the outcome of a very selective procedure, usually involving several iterations between editors and authors). Even when the current state of the paper does not fulfill expectations, it is often possible to help the authors to find a version (perhaps a shortened version) that does. It is the joint responsibility of the referee and the editors to find how that may be possible, though when a paper is likely to face eventual rejection it may be better for all parties to recognise this rather than putting in further fruitless effort
- 2 - **Relevance:** Are all sections of the paper equally interesting and addressing policy issues?
- 3 - **Theory:** Does the paper make efficient use of modern economics? Is there any major relevant body of theory that has been omitted?
- 4 - **Empirical work:** Are you convinced by the evidence produced? Does the author provide sufficient information (data, facts, etc...) to support his arguments? Does he use methods adapted to available data and the issues at stake?
- 5 - **Clarity:** Does the author effectively convey his views? Could the structure of the paper be changed to present the ideas in a more convincing way? Is it easily understandable and pleasant to read? Precise recommendations for shortening/lengthening parts of the paper are welcome.