

Review process

The review process is conducted in a system developed for this purpose. The author places a file with an article that does not contain any personal data. If the file contains any personal data, a message will be sent to the author asking for corrections. The file will not be forwarded to reviewers. Author/s cannot include personal data in the article (e.g. name, surname, email address, affiliation), but you also cannot include information in the article that may enable the identification of information about the author (e.g. placing references to “my” research, any footnotes that could provide such information or acknowledgments).

The double-blind peer review process is used. It is a way to ensure impartiality and prevent any bias when reviewing. With a double-blind review, neither the author nor the reviewer knows who wrote the paper. This increases impartiality and prevents potential biases from influencing the reviewer’s opinion.

After the system administrator checks the file (if there is no data identifying the author), 2 reviewers receive an e-mail asking to perform a review. To do this, they log in to the editorial system and decide to make a review (they can reject the review proposal). The reviewers have 14 days to make the review. The review is performed according to a set template in the editorial system (information included in the Guidelines for Reviewers file). This is a point assessment (section A).

Question	Score from 1 to 5
Is the topic of the article scientifically current?	
Are the presented results new?	
Are the presented methods original?	
Does the title of the article correspond to its content?	
Does the introduction to the article include the objectives of the work?	
Is the terminology used correct?	
Is the cited literature relevant and sufficient?	
Is the illustrative material (drawings, tables) selected correctly?	
Does the abstract of the article clearly describe the methods used and the results obtained?	
Are the conclusions contained in the article appropriate and justified by the content of the work?	
Total	

In section B Reviewers indicate their decision by selecting the appropriate box.

Decision	Please put an "X" in the appropriate box
The article has been accepted for publication without any corrections	
Article accepted for publication after minor corrections (without the need for another review)	
The article has been accepted for publication after significant corrections (need to be reviewed again)	
The article is not suitable for publication in the form presented and requires re-editing	
The article is not suitable for publication	

Reviewers can make some comments to the Author/s or to editors (author does not have access to this section).

Accepted with no corrections and Accepted with minor corrections – This decisions signal that the article in its present form, with minor modifications is suitable for publication. The authors received the decision followed by the suggestions of the peer reviewers and their submission, after alterations, will step on to the next stage.

Accepted with significant corrections/or requires re-editing - These are articles which show promise, but they need further elaborate work. Thus, each reviewer sends his or her recommendations and the authors are encouraged to rewrite their articles. These articles are being reviewed again.

Not suitable for publication – the paper is rejected. This decision signals that there are major concerns over the quality of the scientific materials presented in the paper and that the reviewers consider there is no chance in improving the article in such a way as to become a suitable candidate for publication. This decision is accompanied by a list of reasons which have led to the rejection of the article submitted by each reviewer.

Then Author gets two reviews by the information from the editorial system. Then has to include the changes/comments if necessary within 14 days.