

Guidelines for Reviewers

All participants of the publishing process shall follow the globally recognized best international publication practices established by the [Committee on Publication Ethics \(COPE\)](#). The Reviewers shall observe the COPE's [Ethical Guidelines for Peer Reviewers](#).

Before Accepting the Review Assignment

The Reviewers shall follow the principles of transparency, impartiality, objectiveness and diligence. Before accepting the assignment, the Reviewers shall consider the following points:

- *Area of research and level of expertise.* The Reviewer should not accept assignment for papers that cover fields irrelevant to the Reviewer's area of expertise. In addition, the Reviewer's level of knowledge should be sufficient to provide a high-quality review report.
- *Conflict of interest.* If there is a potential conflict of interest arising from an assignment, the Reviewer shall clearly disclose that to the Editor and refrain from reviewing.
- *Work load and timeframes.* The Reviewer shall objectively estimate the current workload and accept the assignment only having enough time and resources to produce the review report within the reasonable period of time. Reviewing is a very important part of the publishing process but it can be time-consuming, therefore the Reviewer should consider the deadlines established by the Editors. The Reviewer should respond to the Editor's assignment request irrespective of the decision. If the Reviewer declines, he or she is encouraged to suggest another Reviewer for the paper.

Reviewer's Responsibilities

- *Confidentiality.* The manuscripts and the information related to them received by Reviewers during the peer-review process shall be treated as confidential. All such information shall not be disclosed or used for the Reviewer's personal purposes or advantage as well as for someone's disadvantage.
- *Objectiveness and clear wording.* The review reports should be clear, objective, easy for understanding, supported by arguments and should communicate to the Authors how to correct or improve their paper.
- *Responsibility.* The Reviewer should take the reasonable efforts to complete the review by the established deadlines. If it is not doable by some reason, the Reviewer shall inform the Editor accordingly so that the Editor could re-arrange the process timely.
- *Conflict of interest.* If the conflict of interest arises or is identified after the assignment or during the review process, the Reviewer shall disclose that to the Editor immediately and excuse himself (herself) from the reviewing process.
- *Respect and Politeness.* The review reports or comments shall be impersonal and polite. They shall be constructive and relate to the content, not the authors' personality.
- *Proper citations.* If the Reviewer identified that some works or sources are not cited in the paper, this shall be reported.

Conducting the Review

To get acquainted with the Academic OA webinterface for Reviewers, please follow the Reviewer Manual.

To properly evaluate the paper, the Reviewer should consider a number of criteria.

Originality

The paper shall be original and not previously published or plagiarized.

Meeting standards

The paper shall be prepared in conformity with the journal's standards and scope.

Value

The information, research or experiment described in the paper shall be valuable for readers, important for theoretical or practical use and be sufficiently novel.

Quality and Language

The text shall be written in a clear manner easy for understanding, be proofread and free from grammar or stylistic errors.

Structure

The paper should be well-structured, comprise key elements, be consecutive and logical. The Reviewer should check every element of the manuscript:

- Title – if it is relevant, concise and not misleading;
- Keywords – if the keywords relevant to the topic and appropriately listed;
- Abstract – whether it conveys the paper's idea and its content;
- Introduction – whether it reflects the rationale of the paper, indicates the problem and relevance of the paper results as well as review the related literature;
- Methodology – whether the procedure and the experiment / research flow are adequately described; whether the collected data are mentioned accurately; if the equipment, materials and methods for calculation, measurement, evaluation, testing are stated; if the provided information is sufficient to reproduce the experiment or research;
- Results – if the findings are described and whether the results are proven and justified;
- Conclusions and Discussions – whether the conclusions are relevant to the findings; if the implications and recommendations are provided; if the importance of the results is stated;
- References – if all sources are properly mentioned or some important works are missing; if the references are appropriate and relevant to the research; if the sources are listed accurately.

All text elements including figures, tables, equations etc. shall be clear and easy to read.

Together with the review report, the Reviewer shall provide the recommendation for the reviewed paper:

- Accept - paper is recommended for acceptance with no changes (Acceptance). That means the paper should be published in the form as originally presented.
- Accept with optional minor changes (Acceptance). That means the paper should go through minor corrections and be published after that.
- Revise (Mandatory Minor/Major Revision). This recommendation means the paper should be reviewed after the Authors revise their paper in accordance with the Reviewer and/or Editor suggestions.
- Reject (Rejection). That means the paper is not recommended for publication or re-consideration and should be rejected notwithstanding possible major revisions.

The Reviewers are asked to support their comments and reports with arguments and explanations to enable the Authors and the Editors to understand the reasons behind the Reviewer's position. The comments shall be concise, objective and detailed enough to allow the Editors to make their decision and the Authors to improve and revise their work. Personal information about the Reviewer shall be avoided.