

Peer Review Policies of the Journal of Mechanism and Institution Design

1. Our peer-review process is the set of rules used to assess the quality of a submitted manuscript before it is accepted for publication. Independent researchers in the relevant research area assess submitted manuscripts for originality, validity and significance to help Editors determine whether the manuscript should be published in their journal.
2. All research articles published by this Journal undergo peer review. This usually involves an initial review by one of the Editors of the Journal (listed on the Journal web page) who appoints an Associate Editor in charge of the submission. This Associate Editor appoints at least two independent, expert peer reviewers who typically published in the subject area of the submission. The peer review processes is single-blind, i.e., the identity of the authors is known to the editors and reviewers who do not learn the identity of the editors and reviewers.
3. Based on their initial review, manuscripts may be rejected without peer review if the Editors in charge agree that they are not of sufficiently high priority or not relevant to the journal. This fast “desk”-rejection process means that authors are given a quick decision and do not need to wait for the review process.
4. In rare, exceptional, occasions when two independent peer reviewers cannot be secured, the Associate Editor in charge may act as a second reviewer or make a decision using only one report. In these cases, the only available peer review must make a clear and detailed recommendation.
5. Conflicts of interest or particular interests need to be disclosed by all involved persons at all levels of the publication process. For details, refer to the Ethics statement on the Journal web page. This includes (but is not limited to) personal contacts, funding or employment considerations, and other financial or non-financial interests.
6. The experts who are selected to act as reviewers for this Journal are asked to evaluate whether the manuscript is scientifically sound and coherent, whether it duplicates already published work, its statements are correct and reproducible, and whether or not the manuscript is written sufficiently clearly for publication. Institutional email addresses are the preferred means of communication during the review process. The editors will reach a decision based on these reports and, where necessary, they will consult with members of the Editorial Board.
7. The Journal’s peer review practice fully accords to the highest standards employed by the leading journals in the economics profession. The Journal is guided by the by the core practices and policies outlined by the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE).
8. In terms of data policy, the Journal has adopted the American Economic Review data availability policy (<https://www.aeaweb.org/journals/data/data-code-policy>).