

Procedure of the review

Before taking on the role of reviewer, the reviewer should check whether the article falls within their area of expertise and whether there is a potential conflict of interest during the review process. As a rule, it is not acceptable if the reviewer is involved in the same project, acts as a mentor or is otherwise involved in the preparation of the work to be reviewed. By accepting the review, the reviewer confirms that there is no conflict of interest between their role as reviewer and any other professional or personal roles. The articles are reviewed using the prepared review form (offline or via the OJS system).

The review is structured as follows:

a) Assessment of the adequacy and quality of the work

The reviewer should indicate whether the article fulfils a particular criterion (11 criteria in total), and if not, indicate the reasons and the need for changes. The criteria relate to Assessment of thematic suitability; Originality and scholarly contribution; Investigation and relevance of sources; Structure and methodology; Focus and consistency; Clarity of aims, attitudes and ideas; Appropriateness of terminology and language; Scope and relevance of research; Clarity and relevance of conclusions.

b) Special remarks

The reviewer may make special comments on individual parts of the article, highlighting possible errors and shortcomings. He may refer to the methodological and theoretical-conceptual foundation of the article. At the same time, the reviewer can assess the validity of the argumentation presented and highlight the good and bad points of the work.

c) General assessment

The reviewer should suggest publication, revision or non-acceptance of the article according to the following list (the decision is also recorded via the journal web interface):

1. *Accept without changes* - the article can be published without changes,
2. *Accept with changes* - suggested by the reviewer in the review,
3. *Send back for review* - after the author has made the changes suggested in the review,
5. *Unacceptable* – the article is not suitable for publication.

If the review is positive, the article should be categorized according to the following criteria:

1. Original scientific paper
(*Contains unpublished results of original research in complete form. This group of articles also includes systematic reviews and meta-analyses.*)
2. Preliminary note
(*Contains unpublished results of original research in a preliminary form.*)

3. Review article

(Contains an original, concise and critical presentation of an area or part of an area in which the author is actively involved. The role of the author's original contribution to the field in relation to previously published work must be emphasized, as well as an overview of that work.)

4. Professional paper

(Contains useful contributions by and for the profession, but does not necessarily represent original research.)

The preferred deadline for writing a review is two weeks. The length of the review text and the extent of the comments and criticisms are partly determined by the review form, but are at the discretion of the reviewer. Reviewers can attach an annotated version of the original text, which can be made available to the authors.

The review process is anonymous on both sides - the identity of the author remains unknown until the text is potentially published, while the identity of the reviewers of an individual text is only revealed at the reviewer's request. At the end of each year, the journal publishes a list of all reviewers for that year.

Editorial Board