

**Information for Authors, Editors and Reviewers on Standards for:
ACRN Oxford Journal of Finance and Risk Perspectives (ISSN 2305-7394), and the annual ACRN Oxford FRAP Finance Risk and Accounting Perspectives Conference Series**

Version: August 2016 - Table of Contents

Journal Policy	2
Topics	2
Editorial Board	3
Editorial Board	3
Editorial Processes	3
The Process itself.....	3
Ensuring a fair and appropriate peer review process.....	4
Decision whether to review	4
Interaction with peer reviewers.....	4
Reviewer misconduct.....	5
Interaction with authors.....	5
Editorial decision-making.....	5
Editorial and journal processes.....	5
Editorial conflicts of interest	5
Submission Information	6
First publication	6
Anonymization.....	6
Formatting	6
Abstract.....	6
Length.....	6
Editing.....	7
References	7
Author Entitlement and Post-prints	7
Copyright Notice	7
Privacy.....	7
Fees.....	7
Complaints.....	7
Ethical Standards	8
Ethical Considerations for Editors.....	8
Ethical Considerations for Authors.....	8
Ethical Considerations for Reviewers.....	9

Imprint:

ACRN Oxford Ltd., 1 Kings Meadow, Oxford, OX2 0DP, United Kingdom

W: <http://www.acrn-journals.eu/> M: jofrp@acrn.eu

Journal Policy

The ACRN Journal of Finance and Risk Perspectives (JoFRP) is an open-access, strictly academic, double-blind peer reviewed international publication by the ACRN U. publishing house UK. The ACRN FRAP conference series is an annual outlet for high quality research in the field. All article abstracts are indexed in the SSRN database, the social science research network, and are searchable through Google scholar. The journal is included in the h-Index and impact calculations.

This journal and the conference series are special because both aim to provide an outlet for inter-disciplinary and more in-depth research papers with various methodological approaches. The target groups are academics and policy makers who want to make meaning of their fields by acknowledging the methods and theories used in closely related areas. The JoFRP and FRAP thus aims to overcome the self-imposed paradigmatic boundaries and reflexive isomorphisms of the individual fields and invites new and combined perspectives in the field of Finance, Risk and Accounting. Despite its methodological and disciplinary openness it does so with a strong focus on academic rigor and robustness. All articles will be strictly double-blind peer reviewed and authors are frequently invited to discuss the follow-ups of their articles in the FRAP conferences.

Topics

- Quantitative Finance and Risk Modeling
- Economics
- Organisational and Enterprise Risk Management
- Investment Management and Portfolio Building
- Corporate Finance
- Behavioural Finance
- Treasury and Cash Management
- Banking and Insurance
- Entrepreneurial Finance, Crowdfunding and Venture Capital
- Social and Sustainable Finance
- Performance Management
- Accounting, Auditing, Reporting, Corporate Governance
- IFRS and US-GAAP
- Islamic Banking and Finance
- Developmental Finance and Investment

Editorial Board

Dr. Othmar M. Lehner MBA

Professor of Finance and Risk
Director ACRN Oxford Research Network
Vice Dean for Research and Professor for Entrepreneurial Finance and Risk,
Faculty of Management, University of Applied Sciences Upper Austria
Professorial Fellow, Smith School of Enterprise and the Environment, University of Oxford, Academic
Visitor, SAID Business School, University of Oxford, UK

Prof. James M Chen
Michigan State University

Prof. Ahmed Marhfor
University of Quebec, Abitibi-Témiscamingue, Canada

M: jofrp@acrn.eu

Editorial Board

Prof. Alex Nicholls, SAID Business School, University of Oxford, UK
Prof. Julia Mundy, Centre for Governance, Risk and Accountability, University of Greenwich, UK
Dr. Merav Ozair, NYU, New York University, US
Dr. Matthew Haigh, University of London, School of Oriental and African Studies, UK
Dr. Olga Kolokolova, Manchester Business School, University of Manchester, UK
Prof. Minna Martikainen, Hanken School of Economics, Finland
Dr. Juha Kansikas, Professor of Entrepreneurship, University of Jyväskylä, Finland
Prof. Heimo Losbichler, Department Leader Finance and Accounting, University of Applied Sciences
Upper Austria
Dr. Elisabeth Menschl, Senior Lecturer in Research Philosophy and Ethics, Johannes Kepler
Universität Linz, Austria
Prof. Shambu Prasad, Professor in Rural Management and Development, Xavier Institute of
Management India
Dr. Saadiah Mohamad, Professor of Economics, Deputy Dean, Faculty of Business Management,
Universiti Teknologi MARA
Dr. Pascal Dey, University of St. Gallen, Switzerland

Editorial Processes

The Process itself

All involved parties have read and understood the guidelines below and use them as such in their actions and decision-making processes. The editorial board brings forward ideas and suggestions for reviewers and special issues, and sometimes take over the role of acting editors. The editorial board also will be asked for advice and vote in unclear situations and complaints proceedings.

Step One: The acting editor handles manuscript submission, checks for formal criteria and anonymization, and then reads the manuscript to check for a policy-match with the journal and in case identify suitable reviewers.

Step Two: The reviewers (at least two) are invited with the blind manuscript attached. They are asked for their feedback within 4 weeks. The acting editor is responsible for reminders and keeping time.

Step Three: The acting editor reads the reviewers comments and recommendation. Based on these the editor compiles this information (with blinded reviewers names) together with remarks and the final decision made by the editor, and sends it out to the authors. In case of differing suggestions, the acting editor takes the final decision or asks one of the members of the editorial board.

Decisions can be: accepted, minor-revision, major-revision, reject.

Revisions: When a revision is submitted, minor-revisions will be reviewed by the acting editor together with one of the previous reviewers (if possible), major-revisions will be sent out again for a full double-blind review round (if possible same reviewers).

Ensuring a fair and appropriate peer review process

One of the most important responsibilities of editors is organising and using peer review fairly and wisely. Editors should explain their peer review processes in the information for authors and also indicate which parts of the journal are peer reviewed.

Decision whether to review

Editors may reject a paper without peer review when it is deemed unsuitable for the journal's readers or is of poor quality. This decision should be made in a fair and unbiased way. The criteria used to make this decision should be made explicit. The decision not to send a paper for peer review should only be based on the academic content of the paper, and should not be influenced by the nature of the authors or the host institution.

Interaction with peer reviewers

Editors should use appropriate peer reviewers for papers that are considered for publication by selecting people with sufficient expertise and avoiding those with conflicts of interest. Editors should ensure that reviews are received in a timely manner.

Peer reviewers should be told what is expected of them and should be informed about any changes in editorial policies. In particular, peer reviewers should be asked to assess research and publication ethics issues (i.e., whether they think the research was done and reported ethically, or if they have any suspicions of plagiarism, fabrication, falsification, or redundant publication). Editors should have a policy to request a formal conflict of interest declaration from peer reviewers and should ask peer reviewers to inform them about any such conflict of interest at the earliest opportunity so that they can make a decision on whether an unbiased review is possible. Certain conflicts of interest may disqualify a peer reviewer. Editors should stress confidentiality of the material to peer reviewers and should require peer reviewers to inform them when they ask a colleague for help with a review or if they mentor a more junior colleague in conducting peer review. Editors should ideally have a mechanism to monitor the quality and timeliness of peer review and to provide feedback to reviewers.

Reviewer misconduct

Editors must take reviewer misconduct seriously and pursue any allegation of breach of confidentiality, non-declaration of conflicts of interest (financial or non-financial), inappropriate use of confidential material, or delay of peer review for competitive advantage. Allegations of serious reviewer misconduct, such as plagiarism, should be taken to the institutional level (for further guidance see: http://publicationethics.org/files/u2/07_Reviewer_misconduct.pdf).

Interaction with authors

Editors should make it clear to authors what the role of the peer reviewer is because this may vary from journal to journal. Some editors regard peer reviewers as advisors and may not necessarily follow (or even ask for) reviewers' recommendations on acceptance or rejection. Correspondence from editors is usually with the corresponding author, who should guarantee to involve co-authors at all stages. Communicating with all authors at first submission and at final acceptance stage can be helpful to ensure all authors are aware of the submission and have approved the publication. Normally, editors should pass on all peer reviewers' comments in their entirety. However, in exceptional cases, it may be necessary to exclude parts of a review, if it, for example, contains libelous or offensive remarks. It is important, however, that such editorial discretion is not inappropriately used to suppress inconvenient comments.

There should always be good reasons, which are clearly communicated to authors, if additional reviewers are sought at a late stage in the process. The final editorial decision and reasons for this should be clearly communicated to authors and reviewers. If a paper is rejected, editors should ideally have an appeals process. Editors, however, are not obliged to overturn their decision.

Editorial decision-making

Editors are in a powerful position by making decisions on publications, which makes it very important that this process is as fair and unbiased as possible, and is in accordance with the academic vision of the particular journal.

Editorial and journal processes

All editorial processes should be made clear in the information for authors. In particular, it should be stated what is expected of authors, which types of papers are published, and how papers are handled by the journal. All editors should be fully familiar with the journal policies, vision, and scope. The final responsibility for all decisions rests with the editor-in-chief.

Editorial conflicts of interest

Editors should not be involved in decisions about papers in which they have a conflict of interest, for example if they work or have worked in the same institution and collaborated with the authors, if they own stock in a particular company, or if they have a personal relationship with the authors. Journals should have a defined process for handling such papers. Journals should also have a process in place to handle papers submitted by editors or editorial board members to ensure unbiased and independent handling of such papers. This process should be stated in the information for authors. Editorial conflicts of interests should be declared, ideally publicly.

Submission Information

Begin by confirming that *Journal of Finance and Risk Perspectives* is the right journal for your manuscript by reviewing our Policy Statement and note about the kinds of submissions appropriate for *Journal of Finance and Risk Perspectives*. Then, read through some of the tables of contents and freely available articles in the journal to get a sense for the kinds of articles that the *Journal* publishes. Once you've confirmed that *Journal of Finance and Risk Perspectives* is a suitable outlet for your manuscript, please continue with the following steps.

First publication

Submission of a manuscript to *Journal of Finance and Risk Perspectives* is understood to imply that the manuscript is not under consideration by any other journal and is offered to *Journal of Finance and Risk Perspectives* for first publication.

Anonymization

Please anonymize your submission for double blind review. In particular, remove your name from the title page, headers and footers; remove any acknowledgments or references to personal communication; remove any references to your own published or unpublished manuscripts; remove references to other authors' unpublished manuscripts, as references to such manuscripts can potentially reveal your identity or can suggest that you have personal contact with those authors (even if that is not the case).

Formatting

Please use footnotes rather than endnotes for your citations; manuscripts should be in 12-point font Times New Roman with 1-inch margins; everything should be single spaced, including quotations and footnotes. Please use one of the following four formats when preparing your manuscript: any recent version of Microsoft Word (.doc or .docx), PDF (.pdf), WordPerfect (.wpd), or Rich Text Format (.rtf). Please use three headline styles only, (14 bold, 12 bold and 12 italic) and use WORD headline formatting if possible. Tables and Figures must be included in the text, at the appropriate position, with Figure and Table numeration. Tables naming above, figures below. Tables need to be formatted with thin single lines only, no colors. Table font: Times 10pt.

Please use the provided Word template ACRN_STYLE.dotx whenever possible!

Abstract

Please prepare an abstract of less than 250 words to upload with the manuscript.

Length

Please make sure your submission is the appropriate length for its article type: less than 20,000 words for Original Articles (including notes), and less than 6,000 words (including notes) for Discussions. Although different types of articles require more or less space, the editors generally prefer Original Articles to be between 5,000 and 15,000 words.

Editing

In the interest of expediting the review process and increasing chances of a successful submission, authors are strongly encouraged to submit manuscripts that have been carefully edited with an eye to structure and style. All papers should be written in UK or US English (but consistent).

References

The complete style guidelines are those of the **APA 5th edition**, please follow style precisely!

Avoid footnotes!

Full references should include all author's names and initials, date of publication, title of paper, title of publication (italics), volume and issue number (of a journal), publisher and location (books, conferences), page numbers.

Author Entitlement and Post-prints

Authors of accepted papers will receive a PDF file of their published paper which can be used by the author for any teaching and research purposes. It can be reprinted in PhD theses as long as a reference to the original publication is made. It may also be downloaded from the website of the author or the corresponding institution as long as there is a link underneath to the ACRN journals webpages.

Copyright Notice

this is only valid for accepted journal papers, we do not take copyright for conference submissions.

Copyright for papers published is retained by ACRN GmbH. Authors need to ensure and are liable for having the rights to use texts, tables and illustrations in their papers. Authors assign world-wide copyright in both print and other media of all content of their paper to ACRN. This helps us to ensure copyright protection against infringement and allows us to disseminate your article and our journals as wide as possible. Your article will be publicly available at no costs as open-access and the authors can use the articles in the published form in any teaching related activity.

Privacy

We will use any addresses and contact information solely for the stated purposes of this journal and these will not be available for any other purpose or third party.

Fees

Fees for publication in this open access journal are only applicable if the manuscript is accepted for publication. The current fees are displayed at the journal's webpages and are in Pound Sterling. The fees are waived for participants of the FRAP conferences.

Complaints

Any complaints will be taken seriously and should be sent to complaints@acrn.eu. In all journal related matters, complaints will be taken to at least two members of the editorial board for review and advice. The final decision will be a majority vote by at least five members of the editorial board, including the editor in chief.

Ethical Standards

Ethical Considerations for Editors

An editor should give unbiased consideration to all manuscripts offered for publication, judging each on its merits without regard to race, religion, nationality, sex, seniority, or institutional affiliation of the author(s). An editor may, however, take into account relationships of a manuscript immediately under consideration to others previously or concurrently offered by the same author(s).

Unpublished information, arguments, or interpretations disclosed in a submitted manuscript should not be used in an editor's own research except with the consent of the author. However, if such information indicates that some of the editor's own research is unlikely to be profitable, the editor could ethically discontinue the work. When a manuscript is so closely related to the current or past research of an editor as to create a conflict of interest, the editor should arrange for some other qualified person to take editorial responsibility for that manuscript. In some cases, it may be appropriate to tell an author about the editor's research and plans in that area.

If an editor is presented with convincing evidence that the main substance or conclusions of a report published in an editor's journal are erroneous, the editor should facilitate publication of an appropriate report pointing out the error and, if possible, correcting it. The report may be written by the person who discovered the error or by an original author.

Ethical Considerations for Authors

An author should cite those publications that have been influential in determining the nature of the reported work and that will guide the reader quickly to the earlier work that is essential for understanding the present investigation. Except in a review, citation of work that will not be referred to in the reported research should be minimized. An author is obligated to perform a literature search to find, and then cite, the original publications that describe closely related work. For critical materials used in the work, proper citation to sources should also be made when these were supplied by a non-author.

In submitting a manuscript for publication, an author should inform the editor of related manuscripts that the author has under editorial consideration or in press. Copies of those manuscripts should be supplied to the editor, and the relationships of such manuscripts to the one submitted should be indicated.

It is improper for an author to submit manuscripts describing essentially the same research to more than one journal of primary publication, unless it is a resubmission of a manuscript rejected for or withdrawn from publication. It is generally permissible to submit a manuscript for a full paper expanding on a previously published brief preliminary account (a "communication" or "letter") of the same work. However, at the time of submission, the editor should be made aware of the earlier communication, and the preliminary communication should be cited in the manuscript.

An author should identify the source of all information quoted or offered, except that which is common knowledge. Information obtained privately, as in conversation, correspondence, or discussion with third parties, should not be used or reported in the author's work without explicit permission from the investigator with whom the information originated. Information obtained in the course of confidential services, such as refereeing manuscripts or grant applications, should be treated similarly.

The co-authors of a paper should be all those persons who have made significant scientific contributions to the work reported and who share responsibility and accountability for the results. Authors should appropriately recognize the contributions of technical staff and data professionals. Other contributions should be indicated in a footnote or an "Acknowledgments" section. An administrative relationship to the investigation does not of itself qualify a person for co-authorship (but occasionally it may be appropriate to acknowledge major administrative assistance).

Ethical Considerations for Reviewers

A reviewer (or referee) of a manuscript should judge objectively the quality of the complete manuscript and the Supporting Information, including the experimental and theoretical data, the interpretations and exposition, with due regard to the maintenance of high scientific and literary standards. A reviewer should respect the intellectual independence of the authors.

A reviewer should treat a manuscript sent for review as a confidential document. It should neither be shown to nor discussed with others except, in special cases, to persons from whom specific advice may be sought; in that event, the identities of those consulted should be disclosed to the editor.

Reviewers should notify editors of concerns with respect to manuscripts that report research that, based on current understanding, can be reasonably expected to provide knowledge, products, or technologies that could be directly misapplied by others to pose a threat to public health and safety, environment or be used for criminal purposes.