

GUIDELINES FOR REVIEWERS

A review is a critical assessment and evaluation of the content based on which the Editorial Board decides on the publication or non-publication of a proposed author's article. The purpose of the review process is to determine the scientific quality of the article and create legitimacy for publication to the academic community.

Submitted papers are first considered by the Editor to whom they were submitted. Papers that fail to meet a minimum threshold for quality and originality will be rejected without being sent out to reviewers. Papers passing through this initial editorial scrutiny are sent out to two but sometimes more independent reviewers.

All papers undergo a 'double-blind' review process. This process entails sending the author's anonymized manuscript to an expert in the relevant field, ensuring that the author remains unaware of the reviewer's identity before, during, and after the review. Reviewers are not institutionally affiliated with the author of the submitted article.

After the Editorial Board finds potential reviewers, it provides them with an information form. This form contains the manuscript's title, summary, keywords, list of sources used in the research, and a deadline for completing the review. Before accepting or declining an invitation to review, potential reviewers should consider whether the article matches their area of expertise, whether they have a potential conflict of interest, and if they have enough time to conduct the review. Once the reviewer agrees to assess the manuscript, the Editorial Board sends them the original, anonymized manuscript along with a review form.

Reviewers evaluate the article following some already given criteria by filling in a reviewer evaluation form. When writing a manuscript analysis, we ask reviewers to strive to:

- Critically evaluate the logical structure, the validity of the applied methodology and the presentation of its results, the argumentative content of the manuscript, and the viability of the presented hypotheses.
- Critically evaluate the adequacy of linguistic expression and stylistic transmission of opinions.
- Critically evaluate the author's authentic contribution to the research topic concerning the sources one uses.

Based on the analysis, the reviewer will evaluate one of the four possible categorizations of the article:

- Original scientific paper: contains new, as yet unpublished results of scientific research, fully elaborated and presented in an objectively verifiable way, with mostly or completely original contribution of the author.
- Preliminary communication: contains new, as yet unpublished results of scientific research, presented in a predominantly objectively verifiable manner, but incompletely elaborated or presented in a preliminary form as part of a project or wider research.
- Review paper: contains an original, as yet unpublished critical review of a certain area or some part of it in which the author actively participates. The role of the author's original contribution in this area concerning already published works must be emphasized, as well as a review of these works.
- Professional paper: contains knowledge and experience relevant to a particular profession, but has no scientific characteristics.

Eliminative categorization will let editors know that there are serious reasons to avoid publishing the proposed manuscript.

Reviewers may consider that the manuscript may be published, but that it requires substantive refinement. In this case, the editors invite reviewers to provide the author with instructions and guidelines in the review, based on which the author can upgrade the article to the required level. After the author resubmits the paper, the Editorial Board verifies whether the article has been revised following the reviewers' comments and suggestions. The article may be returned for re-examination to the reviewer, especially if the reviewer expressly requests it.

If the reviewer explicitly points out, certain parts or the entire review may not be shown to the author.

Only categorized papers given two positive reviews are published. Finally, based on the returned forms the Editor-in-Chief in cooperation with the relevant Editorial Board makes an objective judgment solely on academic merit and assumes full responsibility for his/her decision to publish the manuscript.