

## GUIDELINES FOR REVIEWERS

Dear reviewers,

We appreciate your assistance in the process of publishing papers in Disputatio philosophica International Journal on Philosophy and Religion. Please read here some of the general information how to write reviews for Disputatio philosophica and then fill in the "Form for reviewers" that we have sent to you together with these guidelines.

The reviewing process is mutually anonymous - the identity of the author remains unknown until the text is published while the identity of the reviewer of an individual text may be released only with the approval of the reviewer.

### 1. GENERAL COMMENTS

The reviewer is required to briefly describe own opinion of the paper in a clear and specific manner. Attention needs to be given to the logical structure of the claims made, the style, contextual consistency of the paper, as well as methodological and theoretical foundation of the paper. When evaluating the quality of the paper, the reviewer needs to keep in mind the originality and scientific contribution made to understanding the topic being dealt with as well as the relevancy to the area it belongs to. After giving your general comment, please proceed to the questions that you can simply answer by "Yes" or "No".

### 2. SPECIAL COMMENTS

Similarly to the general comments, the reviewer may offer some additional comments dealing with individual sections of the paper particularly in regard to any possible errors. Reviewers may include a commented version of the original text, either in a form of Word document or scanned text with comments.

### 3. CATEGORISATION OF A PAPERS

Here are some of the criteria for categorisation of a paper. The reviewer proposes the category, the final decision is made by the editorial staff following recommendations by two reviewers.

- 1) Original scientific paper: a paper that contains unpublished original theoretical and practical results of an original research.
- 2) Preliminary communication: contains one or more new scientific data but without sufficient detail that may be verified as an original scientific paper.

- 3) Review: original and critical presentation of the situation and tendency of development in some field of research with a critical reflection and judgement.
- 4) Professional paper: informs and introduces a problem in the field or presents some original solutions in that particular field.
- 5) Other. Any other category that does not fit into these four categories above.

#### 4. RECOMMENDATION FOR PUBLISHING

In conclusion, the reviewer is required to recommend that the paper will be published, redone, rejected according to the following criteria:

1. The text may be published without any amendments
2. The text may be published pending the amendments proposed in the review
3. The text should be re-reviewed following the amendments proposed in the review
4. The text might be able to published in some other journal
5. The text is not for publishing

The preferred period for a review is four weeks. Although we prefer clear and concise reviews, the length of the review and scope of comments and criticism is left to the discretion of the reviewer.

THE TITLE OF THE PAPER:

GENERAL COMMENTS:

QUESTIONS:

1. Does the content of the paper correspond to the title? **Yes** or **No**
2. Is the summary relevant to the contents? **Yes** or **No**
3. Does the author use language that readers can comprehend? **Yes** or **No**
4. Has the author presented the topic properly, that is, that the topic is not too generalised but rather focused to a certain view that offers new insights? **Yes** or **No**
5. Has the author considered relevant literature regarding to the topic being dealt with? **Yes** or **No**
6. Has the author in addition to presenting the attitudes of other authors presented their own attitude, opinions, criticisms, insights and conclusions? **Yes** or **No**

SPECIAL COMMENTS:

CATEGORISATION OF A PAPERS:

(Please put x at the correct answer]

- 1] Original scientific paper
- 2] Preliminary communication
- 3] Review
- 4] Professional paper
- 5] Other

**RECOMMENDATION FOR PUBLISHING:**

(Please put x at the correct answer]

1. The text may be published without any amendments
2. The text may be published pending the amendments proposed in the review
3. The text should be re-reviewed following the amendments proposed in the review
4. The text might be able to published in some other journal
5. The text is not for publishing

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Reviewer

\_\_\_\_\_