

SLPD Journal Reviewers' guidelines (available also [here](#))

General Information for Reviewers

The SLPD Journal Editorial Board strongly praise the efforts, time and reviewers' knowledge devoted to the Journal. It is important that the manuscripts sent to reviewers are critically evaluated for compliance with the following criteria: novelty, scientific relevance and importance to the specific field and strong evidence for the conclusions that are drawn.

All submitted manuscripts are reviewed by Editors-in-Chief and/or in specific cases, where more consultations are to be provided, the Editorial Board for relevancy to meet our editorial criteria. Manuscripts retained for review are sent to at least two reviewers, chosen by Editors-in-Chief. The SLPD Journal does not accept Authors' suggestions about independent reviewers, who may be considered by editorial team after checking their suitability. The journal applies anonymized double-blind-peer review, in which reviewers do not know the identity of authors, and the authors do not know the identity of reviewers.

Based on the reviews, the Editor-in-Chief: accept the manuscript with or without minor revision, invite the author(s) to revise the manuscript before a final decision is reached, or reject the manuscript based on the reviews due to lack of novelty, insufficient conceptual advance or major technical and/or interpretational issues. Reviewers may recommend a particular course of action in their confidential comments to the Editor, but should bear in mind that the Editors-in-Chief may have to decide based on conflicting advice. Furthermore, editorial decisions are based on an evaluation of the strengths of the arguments raised by each review and by the author(s). The most useful reviewer's reports, therefore, are those that set out clear, substantiated arguments and might include a recommendation of a course of action directed to the authors.

Receiving a Manuscript for Review

The selection of reviewers is critical to the review process and we expect the reviewers to treat this request as confidential. Manuscripts submitted for the SLPD Journal are evaluated through a double-blind-peer review. Please protect the manuscript provided to you for review from any form of exploitation. The reviewers are selected based on the Editor's recommendation or by searching the databases with selected peer-reviewed articles or reviewers list. Upon receiving an invitation letter with the manuscript to review, through the SLPD Journal OJS system, please do the following:

- read the title and abstract of the manuscript to determine whether it falls within your field of expertise,
- click on one of the links received in the invitation e-mail to either accept the review, decline the review or download the manuscript through the SLPD Journal's online submission system (OJS),
- log in to the SLPD Journal's OJS system with the username and password provided in the invitation e-mail and check your details (especially contact details and field of expertise) and correct or add them if needed,
- double-check the manuscript Title page and the Acknowledgements section to determine whether there is any conflict of interest for you (with the authors, their institution or their funding resources) and whether you can review the manuscript impartially,

- contact the Editor-in-Chief for instructions if you have either a time problem or a conflict of interest, so that your deadline can be extended or review assignment cancelled,
- fill in the reviewer's form and write your comments,
- before sending the comments remove your name from the part intended for reviewer authors. There is a section 'Confidential to Editor', where you can write additional comments intended only for the Editor,
- if you wish to write the comments directly into the downloaded text of the manuscript check the settings on your computer (under Properties) to see whether your name appears next to the comments and disable it in a way to protect your anonymity.
- it is important that you choose the category of the paper:
 - An original scientific paper presents the results of original research that has not previously been published in full or in preliminary form.
 - A preliminary communication contains at least one new scientific fact or result that requires immediate publication, but it should not contain sufficient detail to test the results described, as is the case with original scientific articles.
 - A review article contains an overall overview of recent and current research in a particular area. Articles in this category are surveys in nature that should include critical references and evaluations. The references must be complete enough to provide a good insight into the subject matter.
 - A professional paper does not have to be based on original research, but should contribute to the application of well-known research findings and present theoretical concepts.
 - A conference paper is a presentation from a scientific conference, previously delivered at such a conference, published in the form of a full paper and peer reviewed.
- for any inquiries or technical problems contact the Editorial Office. If Editorial Office, after receiving the revised version from authors, feels that reviewer's second opinion is needed, the revised manuscript may be sent to the same reviewer for re-evaluation. The procedure through the OJS system for re-evaluation is the same as for the first evaluation.

The primary purpose of the review is to provide the Editors with the information needed to reach a decision, but they should also instruct the author(s) on how to strengthen their manuscript if revision is a possibility.

The reviewer should answer the following questions:

- How familiar is the reviewer with the topic of the paper?
- The relevance and scope of the literature used in the paper
- Argumentation and logical structure of work
- Selection and application of methodology
- Writing style and comprehensibility
- Do the title, abstract and key terms correspond to the content of the paper? Is there a need, or an opportunity for improvement?
- Briefly explain the importance of the topic the author is dealing with. What would the reviewer identify as strong aspects of the paper? What would the reviewer say are its weaker sides?

- Write down the Review text
- Provide the recommendations for publishing
- Suggest the categorization of the paper?
- Provide comments to editors (not visible to authors)

Based on the evaluation according to the above criteria, the following decisions can be made:

- Accept the paper - only if there are no requirements for revision.
- Minor revision - if minor changes are requested that can be completed in a relatively short timeframe (15–20 days), e.g. language revision, improvement of the discussion, formatting the text and references according to the instructions, inclusion of additional data, minor revision of data presentation, and similar.
- Major revision - if a more thorough revision is required, e.g. more focused introduction, a more detailed description of materials and methods, revision of tables and figures, a more in-depth discussion, more concise conclusions, inclusion of more recent and relevant references, if there is insufficient information regarding ethics approval (where applicable), funding, conflicts of interest, use of AI tools, or authors' contributions. The authors should be able to complete the revision within a reasonable timeframe (up to 30 days).
- If the required revision is so extensive that it cannot be completed within a reasonable timeframe, requires additional experiments or extensive restructuring of the entire manuscript, and the manuscript still merits publication, a rejection with the possibility of resubmission is advised (please write it in your comments to editor).
- Reject for publication - if the manuscript is not acceptable for publication due to repetition of already published data, lack of novelty or relevance, major errors in the premise or methodology, breach of research integrity, lack of ethics approval (where applicable), and similar.

When writing the comments to the Journal OJS submission system, if the reviewer needs to enclose a document with additional comments, he/she is advised to check whether the document is attached before clicking the “CONFIRM” button.

If the reviewer needs more information about the review process, the Editorial Board advises to consult [Peer Review Toolkit](#) compiled by the Peer Review Committee of EASE.

Reviewers' recommendations are gratefully received by the editor; however, since editorial decisions are based on evaluations derived from several sources, reviewers should not expect the editor to consider every recommendation.

Use of AI tools

Reviewers are responsible for keeping the confidentiality of data through the process of evaluation until the final decision is made. This must be kept in mind if using any LLM tools. Large parts of manuscript containing confidential information must not be copied into LLM-based tools. Reviewers are allowed to use only the tools that can assist in formatting language and style, they must not use AI tools to generate reviews.

Conflict of Interest

The SLPD Journal rely on the reviewers to detect a breach of publication policy or ethical conduct before publication. Some of the items the reviewers should be alert for include plagiarism, missing or incomplete attestation, dual submission and/or publication. We try to avoid referees who: have recent or ongoing collaborations with the authors, have commented on drafts of the manuscript, are in direct competition, have a history of dispute with the authors, or have a financial interest in the outcome. However, the Editorial Office may not be aware of the existence of such a situation, therefore we expect the reviewer to inform us about the possibility of a conflict of interest.

If members of Editorial Board or their close collaborators appear as authors submitting to the journal, they are then excluded from the entire process of evaluation. According to Journal's policy, manuscripts are never sent to reviewers from the same institution as the author(s).

Publication Policy and Ethical Considerations

In spite of our best efforts to identify breaches of publication policy or ethical conduct, such as plagiarism or author conflict of interest, the referees who are more familiar with the field are more likely to recognise such problems and should alert the Editors of any potential problems in this regard. In summary, the reviewers are encouraged to communicate suspicion of policy or ethical problems directly to the Editor, who will follow the guidelines recommended by COPE.

For further information you can consult [COPE Ethical Guidance for Peer Reviewers](#). Under no circumstances the reviewers should contact the potential author(s) directly.