

### **Energy Policy – Reviewer Guidelines**

The Editors evaluate all manuscripts prior to formal review. Manuscripts rejected at this stage are either insufficiently original, or have scientific flaws, poor grammar/English language, or are outside the [Aims and Scope of Energy Policy](#). Manuscripts that meet the minimum criteria are sent to at least two subject matter experts for in-depth review.

To be within the aims and scope of *Energy Policy*, a paper needs to both address energy policy and be sound methodologically. Although the ideal paper may make strong contributions to both policy and methodology, *Energy Policy* considers a continuum of papers, from those that make more substantial contributions to policy to those that make more substantial contributions to methodology.

*Energy Policy* generally allows author(s) two or three revision attempts during which all Reviewers' and editor's comments must be addressed by the author(s). The editor may reject a manuscript if it is the editor's view that the revisions made in response to the reviewers' and/or editor's comments are not making sufficient progress toward producing a publishable paper of sufficient merit and quality. The Editors are responsible for the final decision regarding acceptance or rejection of articles. The Editor's decision is final.

The general Elsevier Reviewer Guidelines can be found [here](#), and cover important matters such as ethics and confidentiality.

### **Energy Policy – Review Template**

There are two fields in the online review form:

- a. **Comments to the Author(s):** *Please use this space for any comments that should be forwarded to the author(s). These comments are mandatory. Please use the following to guide your comments:*
  1. If appropriate, please summarize the content of the paper.
  2. What are the paper's strengths and weaknesses? [Please reflect the reasoning for your recommendation to the Editor in these comments]
  3. What are your major recommendations for the improvement of the paper? Please provide a point-by-point list.
  4. What minor recommendations do you have for the improvement of the paper? Please provide a point-by-point list.
  
- b. **Comments to the Editor only:** *Please use this space to enter comments to the Editor that will not be shared with the Author(s). Please use the following Review Template for these comments:*
  1. Is the paper relevant to the readership of *Energy Policy*? **[Yes/No]**

2. Does the paper advance our knowledge of energy policy over previously published work?  
[Yes/No] Please explain.
3. Is the quality of the English writing sufficient for publication?
4. Does the paper provide a complete description of the methods and procedures, so that these could be reproduced by others in the field? [Yes/No]
5. Do you consider this paper likely to become one of the top papers in its field? [Yes/No]
6. If not, how could this paper be improved to raise its profile considerably?
7. What is your recommendation regarding publication in *Energy Policy*?
  - **Accept:** - unchanged (please explain the manuscript's contribution to the literature)
  - **Minor Revision:** - if the paper only needs minor corrections, e.g., spelling errors, correction of units, and other minor revisions to meet the requirements in the Guide for Authors.
  - **Revision:** - if the paper needs corrections that are more significant than just minor revision, but not a significant rewrite/reconstruction.
  - **Major Revision:** - if the paper requires significant reconstruction, correction, expansion, additional references, etc.
  - **Reject:** - if the paper contains insufficient new or novel material, lacks good science, requires additional research work, shows incomprehensible writing, etc.