

Guidelines for reviewers

Before assuming the duty, the reviewer is obliged to consider whether the manuscript entrusted to him for review is in his area of expertise and whether there may be elements for a possible conflict of interest in the review process. In that case, the reviewer is expected to exclude himself from the process and immediately inform the editor-in-chief. By accepting the review, the reviewer confirms that he is not in any conflict of interest.

A personal, critical, but well-intentioned, unbiased and constructive assessment and quality judgment of the manuscript, based on in-depth information on the subject, is entered in the review form, and its categorization is also suggested. Comments are stated in a clear way. The reviewer is obliged to warn about relevant published works that the author failed to mention and draw the attention of the editor-in-chief to possible cases of data plagiarism, copyright infringement or other unacceptable procedures. Inappropriate and personal comments in the review will be considered unacceptable and - if found - the Editorial board will take all appropriate steps.

When reviewing a manuscript, the reviewer must necessarily consider the following elements:

- ✓ scientific and/or professional relevance of the topic, as well as the adequacy of the title and abstract,
- ✓ relevance and verifiability of used scientific methods and validity of professional terminology,
- ✓ the overall text structure, which should be clear, logical and appropriate to the proposed categorization,
- ✓ conclusion based on obtained results, the relevance of the literature, the accuracy of its citation.

The reviewer must also consider whether there are any unnecessary repetitions, errors in the processing and analysis of data and in visual and/or other attachments, as well as possible linguistic and stylistic inaccuracies.

The grade in the form must be accompanied by at least two hundred words of explanation.

Based on the analysis of the mentioned elements, it is necessary to clearly indicate whether the author should make certain changes in his work for the purpose of improvement. If the latter is required, the reviewer should directly indicate which, and suggest possible changes to the work. Finally, the reviewer should give his opinion on whether the reviewed work meets all the standards for publication. Still, the final decision is made by the editor (EiC), i.e. the Editorial board of the journal, based on at least one, but in most cases two peer reviews.

The reviewer may not spread any news about the research, i.e. work that has not been reviewed and/or has not yet been published, as well as to use data from the work for his own research, and is obliged to treat the received manuscript as a confidential document. The reviewer is strictly prohibited to discuss the manuscript, except with the editor or a member of the Editorial board assigned by the editor to communicate with the reviewer. Applying the principle of double-blind review, the reviewer may not enter personal data in the copy of the review that will be delivered to the author, but only in the one intended for the Editorial board. In accordance, the reviewer's form must be submitted electronically in two copies, one signed and with the personal data of the reviewer, and one unsigned and without all these data.

The review is to be delivered one month from the date of manuscript receipt.