

# **Standard Operating Procedure for NRB Economic Review and NRB Working Paper**



**Nepal Rastra Bank**

**Editorial and Publication Guidelines, 2026**

*(Economic Review and NRB Working Paper Series)*



**Nepal Rastra Bank**  
**Economic Research Department**  
Baluwatar, Kathmandu, Nepal  
Website: [www.nrb.org.np](http://www.nrb.org.np)

## 1. Background

The Nepal Rastra Bank Economic Review (NRBER) and the NRB Working Papers (NRBWP) Series are key research publications managed by the Economic Research Department of Nepal Rastra Bank (NRB). These platforms aim to disseminate rigorous research on macroeconomics, monetary policy, financial stability, and various topics pertinent to Nepal's economy and central banking.

The NRBER is a double-blind peer-reviewed journal that publishes original research intended to support evidence-based policymaking. It encourages contributions from both NRB staff and external scholars, fostering academic dialogue while upholding rigorous standards through a formal review process.

The NRBWP Series is aimed at sharing and eliciting comments on ongoing research and preliminary findings from NRB staffs. These papers encompass a wide array of topics in economics, banking, finance, and other relevant areas. Although they do not undergo the same formal peer-review process as the NRBER, working papers still adhere to academic rigor and originality.

Despite their distinct purposes and review procedures, both formats follow a common Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) that governs submission procedures, ethical standards, and publication protocols, ensuring transparency, quality, timeliness, and compliance with international standards. This SOP is applicable to all manuscripts submitted for the NRBER and NRBWP, as well as to all reviewers involved in the peer review process, editorial board members participating in the manuscript evaluation and decision-making processes, and administrative staff overseeing submission and communications.

Guidelines for authors, based on this SOP, will be available on the NRB website. Authors must submit their NRBER and NRBWP article manuscripts via the NRB or designated third-party submission system.

## 2. Agreement

Upon submission, the Author(s) affirm that the manuscript (the "Article") is their original work and does not infringe upon any existing copyright or third-party rights. By submitting the manuscript to the NRBER, the Author(s) agree to transfer the copyright to the Journal upon acceptance and publication. This transfer grants the Journal the

exclusive, worldwide royalty-free right to publish, distribute, reproduce, translate, adapt and archive the manuscript in print and electronic formats, and to authorize third parties to use it in accordance with standard academic practice.

The Author(s) retains the right to use the published version of the Article for non-commercial scholarly purposes, provided that proper citation to the NRBER is given.

For NRBWP published by the NRB, the Author(s) retain copyright while granting NRB a non-exclusive license to publish and distribute the paper in the form of working paper.

### **3. Purpose**

This SOP clearly delineates the roles, responsibilities, timelines, and procedures for all stakeholders involved in the manuscript submission, review, and publication process of the NRBER and NRBWP. This includes authors, reviewers, the editorial board, and administrative support, ensuring that everyone understands their duties and the workflow to maintain efficiency and transparency throughout the process.

### **4. Submission Fees**

NRB does not impose any submission or publication fees on authors, in order to encourage broader participation. All stages of the manuscript submission process are free of charge, which includes initial submission, peer review, revisions and resubmissions, and final publication in both print and online formats. This policy aims to ensure that financial constraints do not act as a barrier for researchers.

### **5. Mandate**

#### **5.1. Focus and Scope**

NRBER and NRBWP feature analytical, evidence-driven articles on contemporary economic issues in Nepal, alongside emerging topics in economics, banking, finance, and management. All manuscripts submitted for consideration undergo a double-blind review process before final approval by the Editorial Board.

#### **5.2. Priority Topics**

Priority topics include, but are not limited to:

- Monetary policy theory, its design and effectiveness, transmission channels
- Financial sector development, regulatory frameworks, financial stability

- International finance – trade, balance of payments, foreign direct investment, foreign exchange management, financial flows, etc.
- Macroeconomic stability
- Bank lending and risk management related
- Financial inclusion, digital finance, fintech, and retail payments
- Liquidity management and liquidity standards
- Integration of Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) and climate risk into banking supervision
- Financial sector innovation
- Economic growth, investment, consumption and welfare
- Inflation dynamics

### **5.3. Quality Standards**

NRB adheres to strict quality standards to maintain journal's quality to ensure credibility, trust, and scholarly integrity. The following measures are implemented to uphold these standards.

### **5.4. Academic Rigor**

Academic rigor is maintained through methodological soundness, including a strong theoretical foundation, valid econometric models, and replicable results. Data credibility is ensured by the use of reliable, official sources. Correct interpretation involves clear reasoning that logically links empirical results to conclusions.

### **5.5. Policy Relevance**

Research must provide actionable insights with clear policy recommendations relevant to NRB operations or wider economic institutions wherever applicable. Contribution to existing literature, meaning research should add fresh perspective or original findings in the Nepalese and broader economic context, is valued.

### **5.6. Clarity and Presentation**

Clarity is achieved through a well-organized flow, logical coherence, and consistent narrative. Language must be concise, coherent, and professionally written. Referencing must follow the latest edition of the American Psychological Association (APA) style, with accurate citations for all sources; the use of reference manager software is recommended. Visuals such as tables, figures, and equations must be presented clearly and effectively.

## 5.7. Ethical and Editorial Standards

Manuscripts must be original, plagiarism-free, and double-checked with detection tools. Peer review integrity is maintained through double-blind evaluation by reviewers free from conflicts of interest. Transparency is ensured through full documentation of review history and editorial decisions, with confidentiality maintained throughout the process.

## 6. Editorial Board

### 6.1. Composition

The editorial board is constituted in accordance with the provisions outlined in the prevailing *Nepal Rastra Bank Prakashan Nirdeshika, 2079, Section 7*. It operates under the Economic Research Department. The composition of the Editorial Board is as follows:

- **Editor-in-Chief (Chairperson):** Executive Director, Economic Research Department
- **Editors (Members):** Two Directors of the Bank and two Editors from regional universities, nominated by the Editor-in-Chief (as per Clause 6.4) from the editorial basket.
- **Co-Editor(s) (Member/s):** One Deputy Director, nominated by the Editor-in-Chief (as per Clause 6.4).
- **Secretary (Non-Member):** Deputy Director, Publication Division, Economic Research Department.
- **NRB Working Paper (NRBWP) Series:** The working papers will be finalized through a desk review process by the Co-Editor(s).

### 6.2. Key Responsibilities of the Editorial Board

The key responsibilities of the editorial board include:

- Maintaining the academic quality and policy relevance of publications,
- Ensuring a fair and double-blind review process for all manuscripts,
- Providing final decisions regarding manuscript acceptance or rejection following peer review, and
- Upholding NRB's research ethics, standards, and reputation for excellence.

### 6.3. Authority and Responsibilities of the Editor-in-Chief

The authorities and responsibilities of Editor-in-Chief are as follow:

- Appoints editors and co-editors,

- On recommendation of editors, updating the roster of reviewer, oversees and supports the work of editors, co-editors, and reviewers,
- Chairs editorial board meetings,

The Editor-in-Chief may delegate authority and responsibility, in whole or in part, to an Editor or Co-Editor.

#### 6.4. Eligibility criteria for editors and co-editors

The eligibility criteria for editors and co-editors are as follows:

**Editor:** Must be a first-class officer of the Bank holding a PhD in Economics and have at least one publication in a reputable national or international journal. In the case of university faculty, the Editor must hold a PhD in a relevant subject and have at least one publication in a reputable national or international journal.

**Co-Editor:** Must be at least a second-class officer of the Economic Research Department holding a PhD or have at least one publication in a reputable national or international journal.

#### 6.5. Authority and Responsibilities of Editors and Co-Editors

The authorities and responsibilities of editors and co-editors are as follows:

- Conduct the initial screening (desk review) of manuscripts and may desk-reject manuscripts that are out of scope, of poor quality, or plagiarized
- Notify the Editorial Board and the Editor-in-Chief and, depending on the manuscript's quality, either reject or send it for peer review.
- Review feedback from reviewers and forward the final comments to authors for revision or final submission.
- Review resubmitted manuscripts and provide the editorial board a recommendation for the acceptance or rejection decision.

#### 6.6. Responsibilities of the Secretary (Non-Member)

The key responsibilities of secretary include:

- Assist in organizing, scheduling, and coordinating meetings of the editorial board,
- Prepare, maintain, and distribute meeting agendas, minutes, and relevant documentation,
- Maintain official records, correspondence, and archival materials related to editorial activities and,
- Provides logistical and administrative support to the Editorial Team as required.

## 7. Peer Review Process

The NRBER follow a double-blind peer review process, ensuring that neither the authors nor the reviewers are aware of each other's identities throughout the evaluation.

All submissions undergo an initial screening (pre-review check or desk review) by the editor or the co-editor, to assess basic compliance, relevance, and suitability for the journal's scope. Manuscripts may be rejected at this stage if these criteria are not met. Those that meet the criteria are typically forwarded to two independent reviewers, expert in their field, for a detailed evaluation.

The final decision regarding acceptance, revision, or rejection rests with the Editorial Board, which considers the reviewers' recommendations and the manuscript's overall quality.

To maintain the integrity and impartiality of the review process, Editorial Board members do not participate in decisions on manuscripts they have authored or co-authored, or that are submitted by their family members, close colleagues, or collaborators. The peer review of such manuscripts is managed independently, without the involvement of the conflicted editor or their research group.

## 8. Process Flowchart with Timeline for Manuscript Submission and Review

This section provides a clear outline of the manuscript submission, review, and decision-making process within the NRB, ensuring transparency and efficiency at each stage.

### 8.1. Submission Stage

The author submits the manuscript through NRB or designated third-party submission system for consideration in Volume 38 onwards. The Editorial Secretariat acknowledges, logs, and forwards the manuscript for blind desk review within 3 working days of submission.

### 8.2. Initial Screening (Desk Review)

- The desk review should be conducted by a co-editor and/or an editor, selected by the Editor-in-Chief, based on their respective expertise, within 10 working days.
- The scope includes inspecting formatting, organization, writing quality, fictitious citations, and references; conducting a plagiarism check and assessing relevance to NRB priorities and suitability for the journal.
  - Peer review if it meets basic standards,

- Desk reject if it is out of scope, of poor quality, or plagiarized, or
- Send it back to the author for revisions to enhance its likelihood of a successful peer-review process if the manuscript demonstrates potential.
- For NRBWP, when the Editor/Co-Editor considers a manuscript appropriate for publication, no further review is required, and the process ends at this stage.
- The Editorial Secretariat notifies the author(s) of any rejection decision within three working days of the final decision.
- The Editorial Secretariat also notifies the decision to the Editor-in Chief.

### **8.3. Reviewer Assignment**

Within five working days after desk review, the editor or co-editor must select two potential reviewers depending on their area of expertise and inform to Editor-in-Chief. The editorial secretariat ensures there is no conflict of interest, confirms the reviewer's acceptance, and forwards the manuscript to the reviewer within next 6 working days, maintaining double-blind anonymity. The secretariat also sends guidelines and deadlines to the reviewers.

### **8.4. Peer Review**

Reviewers are expected to complete their review within 45 days from the date of manuscript receipt. The editorial secretariat sends review guidelines, deadlines, and reminders for the deadlines or delays.

### **8.5. Post-Review**

The editorial secretariat sends the complete set of reviewer feedback to the editor/co-editor within seven working days after the review is completed. The editor/co-editor examines the reviewers' comments and ensures that they are constructive, internally consistent, and aligned across reviewers and the editorial team. The editor/co-editor then instructs the editorial secretariat to compile and format the review documents and forward the final consolidated comments to the author(s) for revision or final submission within three working days following the editor/co-editor's review. However, the editor or co-editor shall recommend to the Editor-in-Chief that the manuscript be rejected if all reviewers' comments are unfavorable for publication. In cases where reviewers' recommendations are split, the editor or co-editor shall exercise discretion, taking into account the relevance of the topic, the scope of required improvements, and the manuscript's potential contribution to the field.

## **8.6. Author Revision and Resubmission**

The standard timeline for author revisions is one month for minor/minimal revisions and 3 months for major revisions. Authors must prepare a detailed response letter that includes both comments and response to each comment.

## **8.7. First Revision and Resubmission**

The Editorial Secretariat forwards the manuscript to the Editor or Co-Editor within three working days of final submission. The editor or co-editor reviews the revised manuscript and may, if deemed necessary, forward it to the reviewer, with the time limit of 10 working days, to verify that all reviewers' comments have been adequately addressed. Editors or co-editors along with reviewers are satisfied with author response, then editors or co-editor shall submit a recommendation for acceptance or rejection to the Editor-in-Chief.

## **8.8. Second Revision and Resubmission**

In case editors or co-editors or reviewers considers that the manuscript requires marginal improvements, then they can ask for minor revisions, allowing authors to respond within 7 days.

## **8.9. Post Editor/Co-Editor Recommendations (This applies only to NRBER)**

Within seven working days following the editor/co-editor's recommendation, the Editor-in-Chief should place the final manuscript before the Editorial Board for a decision, along with the recommendations.

## **8.10. Editorial Decision**

The Editorial Board makes the final decision following the recommendations of reviewers, and editors and co-editors. The decision on manuscripts includes:

- Accepting the manuscript as it is or reject the manuscript.

In case there is a conflict between the decision by the external reviewer and the co-editors and/or editors, then the Editor-in-Chief, after careful consideration, shall provide an appropriate decision on it.

Following acceptance, co-editors shall language and consistency checks, and figure/table formatting before publication with the help of publication team. The final publication involves publishing online (NRB website) and in a print version, archiving the manuscript and review records for transparency, and disseminating the publication

through NRB communication channels and networks. The Editorial Secretariat publishes the Journal and informs the author(s) of its availability online.

## **9. Guidelines for Authors**

### **9.1. Submission Requirements**

#### **9.1.1. Manuscript Format**

- The manuscript should be submitted in Microsoft Word (DOC, DOCX) or Rich Text Format (RTF) or LaTeX in a single-column format. Authors should provide the document file if the manuscript is prepared in Microsoft Word, and the .tex file along with all associated files if prepared in LaTeX.
- The length of the manuscript should not exceed 10,000 words, excluding references and appendices.
- An abstract should highlight the purpose, methodology, and findings in no more than 150 words.
- The manuscript should be prepared in English font Times New Roman, 12-point, double-spaced with wide margins (1 inch) on A4-size paper.
- A manuscript should generally include the following core sections: Introduction, Methods and Data, Results and Discussion, and Conclusion and Policy Implications. Authors are free to include additional sections, such as a separate Literature Review, and may present policy implications either within the Discussion or Conclusion sections, as appropriate.

#### **9.1.2. Headings**

- Headings must be descriptive and concise. Use three levels of headings as needed.
  - Level 1 heading is the main heading that represents sections and must be centered, bold, capitalized, font size 14, with 8 points spacing before and after, and double line spacing. A short description of a section is preferred after each Level 1 heading.
  - Level 2 heading is a subheading of Level 1 and must be left-aligned, bold, title case, font size 12, with 6 points spacing before and after, and double line spacing.
  - Level 3 heading is a subheading of Level 2 and must be left-aligned, bold italic, title case, font size 12, with 6 points spacing before and after, and double line spacing.

- Do not include only one subheading under a section. If no other subheadings are needed, integrate the content directly under the main heading. Do not number or label Level 1 headings using numerals or letters.

### 9.1.3. Tables

- Use Arabic numerals for sequencing (e.g., Table 1, Table 2).
- Provide a succinct title not exceeding 12 words. Notes should be placed below the table and above the source, using Times New Roman font size 10 to describe the table contents.
- Provide a table source in italic case at the end. If datasets are too large or tables too wide, tables can be placed in landscape view or in an appendix.
- Regression results should be presented in a compact, standardized format, not directly copied from statistical software outputs. Each regression table must be self-contained, with detailed table notes.
- Dependent and independent variables must be labeled using brief, descriptive names rather than abbreviations. Authors should include the complete names and definitions of all variables in the table notes.
- Standard errors should be placed immediately below the corresponding coefficients. Use asterisks to indicate levels of statistical significance.
- Numerical values should be reported with appropriate decimal precision up to 2 places to avoid false accuracy.

### 9.1.4. Figures

- Use Arabic numerals in sequential order (e.g., Figure 1, Figure 2).
- Provide a succinct title not exceeding 12 words. If the figure contains text (e.g., axis labels), use Times New Roman, font size 10.
- If included, a figure legend or key should be within the figure boundaries and clearly explain any symbols or notations.
- Include figures that provide clear insights; otherwise, place them in the Appendix.
- Include figure notes only when necessary to clarify content, placed below the figure and above the source, written in Times New Roman, font size 10. Cite the source of each figure in italic font at the end (if needed).

### 9.1.5. Equations

All mathematical expressions must be created as editable text using an equation editor (e.g., Microsoft Equation Editor, LaTeX) and must not be submitted as images. Equations should be numbered consecutively, if necessary, with the number placed in parentheses aligned to the right margin.

#### **9.1.6. Title Page**

- The manuscript title should be concise, informative, and reflect the manuscript's content.
- Avoid abbreviations, acronyms, or mathematical formulae unless widely recognized.
- The title should be self-explanatory for a broad academic audience, including policymakers and non-specialists.
- Include each author's full name; for multiple authors, indicate the corresponding author clearly. Provide the email address and telephone/fax number for each author (if available). Provide each author's institutional affiliation(s) using lower-case superscript letters (e.g., <sup>a</sup>, <sup>b</sup>) placed immediately after the author's name with full postal addresses.
- Include JEL classification and keywords (maximum 5) written in English.
- Avoid keywords with multiple words (using "and" or "of").
- Provide acknowledgements, disclose any financial support, affiliations, or competing interests in separate pages.

#### **9.1.7. References and Citations**

- The manuscript should provide proper in-text citation and references following APA (latest edition). The reference list should include only the materials cited in the body of the article, and all entries must be complete and accurate. Fictitious references are serious academic misconduct and can lead to desk rejection or retraction in case of published articles. Clarification and secondary details can be placed in footnotes.
  - APA Style Guide:  
<https://apastyle.apa.org/style-grammar-guidelines/references/examples>
  - Reference Examples:  
<https://apastyle.apa.org/instructional-aids/reference-examples.pdf>

#### **9.1.8. Footnotes and Units**

Footnotes to the text should be numbered consecutively with superscript Arabic numerals and placed at the bottom of the page on which they appear. Footnotes to tables should use superscript lowercase letters (e.g., <sup>a</sup>, <sup>b</sup>, <sup>c</sup>). The International System of Units (SI) is the preferred unit of measurement. If non-SI units are used, the SI equivalent must be provided in parentheses.

## 9.2. Submission Process

The submission process entails following aspects:

- Manuscripts, along with data and codes, must be submitted through NRB's or a designated third-party submission system for consideration in Volume 38 onwards. Submissions through official email address (review@nrb.org.np) are considered for prior volumes.
- It is encouraged to include a separate sheet for data description and codes to facilitate the replication of results.
- All submissions must include three separate files:
  - Title Page as outlined in Section 9.1.5.
  - Anonymous Manuscript that should not contain any identifying information. Authors are recommended not to include any information that may disclose their identity and compromise the peer review.
- Authors are required to declare that the manuscript is original and has not been submitted elsewhere, that the work is free from plagiarism, and they will adhere strictly to research ethics and the guidelines set forth by NRB. The *Editorial Board reserves the authority to retract any published paper found to contain fabricated results, fictitious citations, or plagiarized content.*
- Cover letter outlining the significance and fit with NRB journal scope is recommended but optional.

## 9.3. Replication Policy

Since 2026, NRB prioritizes mandatory replication policy, requiring authors to clearly and precisely document datasets and programs, and make them readily available to researchers for replication. Authors of accepted papers that include empirical, simulation, or experimental analyses require to submit, prior to publication, the data, programs, and all relevant computational details necessary to ensure replicability when requested based on the decision of the EB. The data and programs will appear alongside the article in NRB website. *This policy does not apply to working papers due to the preliminary nature of their findings.*

#### 9.4. Generative AI use policy

Authors may use generative AI tools to support manuscript preparation, provided such use remains under full human oversight and control. However, NRB does not permit the use of generative AI for econometric analysis or for the interpretation of empirical results. Any use of generative AI must be transparently disclosed in the Methods section of the manuscript. Authors remain fully responsible and accountable for the accuracy, originality, and integrity of all content in their work. Finally, AI tools cannot be credited as an author or co-author of any submission.

#### 9.5. Revision and Resubmission

Revisions and resubmissions depend upon feedbacks from co-editors and editors, and external reviewers, and authors are responsible for addressing the feedbacks accordingly. Some key aspects of revisions and resubmissions have been provided as follows:

- Co-editors and editors may send manuscript back to author for revisions before sending it for peer-review or they may provide their feedback along with the feedback from reviewers. However, *coalesced feedbacks are provided to authors as possible for easy reconciling of conflicting feedbacks.*
- Authors must revise their manuscript according to the feedback provided. A detailed response letter addressing each comment must accompany the revised manuscript. The standard time allowed for revision is one month for minor revisions and three months for major revisions.
- Requests for extension may be considered on a case-by-case basis by the Editor/Co-editor.

### 10. Guidelines for Reviewers

#### 10.1. Timeline

Reviewers are expected to acknowledge the review invitation by agreeing or declining within six working days of receipt, else the invitation will be void. The standard review period is 45 days from the date the manuscript is received. If additional time is required, reviewers must request an extension at least seven working days prior to the assignment deadline. Reviewers should notify the Editor/Co-editor promptly of any expected delays to support timely decision-making and maintain the publication schedule.

#### 10.2. Scope of Review

Reviewers should evaluate the manuscript based on the following criteria:

- **Relevance to NRB Priorities:** Assess alignment with NRB's mandate, monetary policy, financial sector development, or macroeconomic stability themes. Consider the contribution to ongoing economic concerns or policy formulation in Nepal and the practical applicability of findings to the central bank's operations.
- **Methodological Rigor and Data Reliability:** Evaluate the appropriateness and soundness of the research design, theoretical framework, and hypotheses. Assess the validity, credibility, and reliability of data sources. Scrutinize the robustness of analytical tools, econometric models, or simulations used. Consider the replicability of results with the data and code provided. Ensure the soundness and accuracy of interpretations and conclusions.
- **Policy Relevance and Practical Implications:** Judge the novelty and originality of the research topic in the Nepalese and international context. Assess the contribution to academic literature and policy discussions. Evaluate the clarity and feasibility of policy implications or recommendations for NRB and broader stakeholders. Ensure conclusions are evidence-based and supported by the analysis.
- **Clarity of Structure and Writing Quality:** Review the logical flow and organization of the paper. Assess the clarity, consistency, and conciseness of arguments. Verify proper in-text citations and referencing according to APA. Evaluate the language and professional presentation of tables, figures, and equations. Ensure the abstract and keywords accurately reflect the manuscript's content.

### 10.3. Review Ethics

Reviewers must adhere strictly to the highest ethical standards.

- **Confidentiality:** Manuscripts and all related materials must be treated as strictly confidential. Reviewers must not share, discuss, or use the content for personal research before publication.
- **Avoidance of Bias:** Manuscripts must be evaluated objectively based on their quality and academic merit.
- **Conflict of Interest (COI):** Reviewers must immediately declare any potential conflict of interest to the Co-editor.
- **Professional Conduct:** Feedback must be constructive, respectful, and focused on improving the manuscript. Personal remarks or offensive comments are prohibited. Reviewers must uphold NRB's reputation for integrity and excellence in research.

### 10.4. Deliverable

Reviewers are required to produce and submit a specific, measurable, and tangible deliverable to the Editorial Board after evaluating a manuscript, as outlined in Annex 2. The deliverable should address the manuscript's fit with NRB's policy and research

priorities, its novelty and added value, the appropriateness, rigor, and clarity of its methodology, the practical relevance and soundness of its conclusions, and the overall logical structure and writing quality. It would be particularly helpful to the authors if specific comments are offered on both the strengths and weaknesses of the paper, as well as clear guidance on what would be required for the paper to be considered publishable.

The final recommendation must be clearly marked as one of the following:

- **Accept** (the manuscript meets publication standards),
- **Minor Revision** (small changes needed),
- **Major Revision** (substantive improvements required),
- **Reject** (the manuscript is not suitable for publication).

Articles rejected previously are not considered in future submissions.

## **11. Guidelines for Administrative Support**

The Publication Division of the ERD acts as the Editorial Secretariat and is responsible for supporting all editorial functions and processes.

### **11.1. Responsibility**

The Secretariat is responsible for manuscript tracking, maintaining a comprehensive database of submissions, reviewer assignments, deadlines, and editorial decisions. It ensures double-blind review compliance by removing all author identifiers before sending manuscripts to reviewers. The Secretariat also prepares and maintains the Reviewer Roster and submits it to the Editorial Board for approval.

### **11.2. Communication**

The Secretariat acknowledges receipt of all submissions promptly. It manages the sending of reviewer invitations and subsequent reminders to facilitate timely communication. It conveys all editorial decisions and official correspondence to authors and reviewers on behalf of the Editorial Board, the Editor-in-Chief, and the Editors/Co-Editors.

### **11.3. Record Keeping**

The Secretariat stores all documents in an organized manner, including submission files, plagiarism reports, review reports, decision letters, and all related correspondence, ensuring a complete and accessible record of the publication process.

### **11.4. Journal Repositories and DOI**

The Secretariat uploads the published versions of the NRBER and NRBWP to relevant online journal repositories and indexing platforms subscribed by NRB and ensures that each published paper is assigned a Digital Object Identifier (DOI). The DOI must be displayed in the footer of the final published version. The Secretariat also makes necessary arrangements for repository subscriptions to enhance the accessibility, visibility, and citation of NRB publications.

### **11.5. Cover page of each manuscript**

The published version of each manuscript must include a cover page providing complete bibliographic and manuscript details, including the title, author information (name, affiliation, and email address of the corresponding author), manuscript history (dates received, received in revised form, and accepted), abstract, keywords, and JEL classification. The cover page and header to each page must also display the DOI, journal name, year, volume, issue, and page numbers.

### **11.6. Submission portal**

NRB accepts manuscripts for consideration for publication in the NRBER and NRBWP only through NRB's or a designated third-party submission system. Submissions sent via email (review@nrb.org.np) will not be considered from Volume 38 onwards. Authors submitting manuscripts by email will be notified and requested to resubmit through the portal from Volume 38 onwards.

## **12. Guidelines for Generating the Reviewer Roster**

The Reviewer Roster shall be developed and maintained based on the following criteria to ensure high-quality, fair, and timely peer review.

### **12.1. Subject-Matter Expertise**

Reviewers must possess strong and comprehensive expertise in the specific academic or professional fields relevant to the scope of the Journals, such as economics, finance, banking, and related disciplines.

### **12.2. Demonstrated Academic or Professional Credentials**

Reviewers should hold recognized academic qualifications or have substantial professional experience in fields aligned with the journal's scope, demonstrating a deep understanding of the subject matter.

### **12.3. Experience with Peer-Reviewed Publications**

Preference shall be given to individuals who have prior experience as authors, reviewers, or editors of peer-reviewed publications, as this demonstrates familiarity with scholarly standards and the peer review process.

Effective from: 2083-01-30 [13 May, 2026]