

Disputatio philosophica

International Journal on Philosophy and Religion

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 the general information on 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.

Disputatio philosophica does not provide the reviewers with a financial compensation for contributing to the peer review process.

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 the 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 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 the form of a Word document or as a scanned text with comments.

3. CLASSIFICATION OF PAPERS

Here are the criteria for classification of a paper. The reviewer proposes a category and 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- 1) Original scientific paper: a paper that contains unpublished original theoretical and practical results of an original research.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 new scientific data but without sufficient detail that would enable verification as in original scientific papers.
- 3) Review: original and critical presentation of the situation and of the 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 be published, redone or 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 be published in some other journal
5. The text is not for publication

The preferred period for a review is four weeks. While we prefer clear and concise reviews, a review should not be shorter than 500 words. Other than that, the length of review and the scope of comments and criticism is left to the discretion of the reviewer.

FORM FOR REVIEWERS

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 content? **Yes** or **No**
3. Does the author use language that readers can comprehend? **Yes** or **No**
4. Has the author presented the topic properly, in a way that the topic is not too generalised and has the author focused on a certain perspective that offers new insights? **Yes** or **No**
5. Has the author considered relevant literature on the topic being dealt with? **Yes** or **No**
6. Has the author presented their own attitude, opinions, criticism, insights and conclusions in addition to presenting the attitudes of other authors? **Yes** or **No**

SPECIAL COMMENTS:

PAPER CLASSIFICATION:

(Please mark X beside your chosen answer)

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

RECOMMENDATION FOR PUBLISHING:

(Please mark X beside your chosen 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 be published in some other journal
5. The text is not for publication

Date: _____

Reviewer: _____