



Information for reviewers

We rely on peer-reviewers to help us determine the quality of submissions and to only publish those that are suitable. We are indebted to them for their time and effort. Please take note of the following guidelines.

Confidentiality

Reviewers are entrusted to treat the manuscripts that they see as confidential. Reviewers should not use knowledge of the work, before its publication, to further their own interests. Sharing, discussing with other colleagues, and distributing the material under review is also unethical and against the policy of the journal. Please see the Committee on Publications Ethics Ethical Guidelines for Peer Reviewers: <http://publicationethics.org/resources/guidelines>

Reviewer responsibilities

Reviewers are required to provide the qualified and timely assessment of the scholarly merits of the manuscript. The reviewer takes special care of the real contribution and originality of the manuscript. The review must be fully objective. The judgment of the reviewers must be clear and substantiated by arguments.

The reviewers assess manuscript for the compliance with the profile of the journal, the relevance of the investigated topic and applied methods, the scientific relevance of information presented in the manuscript, the presentation style and scholarly apparatus. The review has a standard format.

The reviewer must not be in a conflict of interest with the authors or funders of research. If such a conflict exists, the reviewer is obliged to promptly notify the Editor-in-Chief. The reviewer shall not accept to perform peer review beyond the field of his/her full competence.

Reviewers should alert the Editor-in-Chief to any well-founded suspicions or the knowledge of possible violations of ethical standards by the authors. Reviewers should recognize relevant published works that have not been considered in the manuscript. They may recommend specific references for citation, but shall not require to cite papers published in Acta Medica Medianae, or their own papers, unless it is justified.

The reviewers are expected to improve the quality of the manuscript through their suggestions. If they recommend correction of the manuscript prior to publication, they are obliged to specify the manner in which this can be achieved.

Any manuscripts received for review must be treated as confidential documents. Reviewers must not use unpublished materials disclosed in submitted manuscripts without an explicit written consent of the authors.

Timeliness: We generally ask reviewers to return their review within 2 weeks, but we are able to extend this if required. When asked to review, please inform the editorial office if you are not able to return the review by the stipulated deadlines. If you are unable to undertake the review a suggestion of an alternative qualified reviewer is highly welcomed.

Manuscript evaluation: The role of reviewer is very important in critically assessing the scientific merit of a submitted manuscript and helping the editor to make the publication decision. We ask reviewers to recommend whether the manuscript is suitable for publication; does not merit publication, or needs revision and reassessment before publication. Authors greatly value constructive comments from the reviewers, and we ask that all reviewers are polite when making any comments so that we can pass these on to the authors. Comments



should be composed in a clear, reasonable, and constructive manner that will help the author to improve the manuscript.

We provide reviewers with a checklist and ask to consider the following items:

Originality - is the manuscript original, or does it report what is already known and has been published.

Importance - is the manuscript relevant to general readers of the journal, within the scope of the journal, adds something new to the existing literature

Scientific and clinical interest - does the manuscript report appropriate methodology, design, statistical approach, interpretation of findings, and provide up to date references

Language and length - is the manuscript well-written, easy to follow, and does it use appropriate vocabulary

Figures and tables - are these necessary and helpful, and is the presentation and quality suitable

Ethical concerns - do you have any concerns about the ethics of the research being reported in the manuscript

The journal does not provide financial reward to reviewers. The authors and the journal greatly appreciate the voluntary efforts, and the time they offer to evaluate manuscripts. Review is considered an integral part of academic and research and we acknowledge reviewers where we can. We provide a list of reviewers at the first month of each calendar year, and we are happy to send a certificate of participation to the reviewer's supervisor if requested.