



Peer Review Policy

Acta Medica Medianae uses double-blind review system for all papers. Each manuscript is reviewed by at least two reviewers. The reviewers act independently and they are not aware of each other's identities. The reviewers are selected solely according to whether they have the relevant expertise for evaluating a manuscript. They must not be from the same institution as the author(s) of the manuscript nor be their co-authors in the recent past. No suggestions of individual reviewers by the author(s) of the manuscript will be accepted.

The purpose of peer review is to assist the Editorial Board in making a decision of whether to accept or reject a paper. The purpose is also to assist the author in improving papers. Remarks and suggestions made by the editors and reviewers are submitted to the author for final revision. The papers are submitted in electronic form. The manuscripts accepted for printing are not to be returned to the authors.

The authors must acknowledge that they have disclosed all and any actual or potential conflicts of interest with their work or partial benefits associated with it. In the same manner, the journal is committed to objective and fair peer-review process of the submitted paper, as well to prevent any actual or potential conflict of interests between the editorial and review personnel and the reviewed material ([Clinical and Experimental Work Code](#)). *Acta Medica Medianae* is committed to upholding the highest standards of publication ethics and takes all possible measures against any publication malpractices.

Peer review process

Manuscripts are sent for review only if they pass the initial evaluation regarding their form and thematic scope. A special care is taken that the initial evaluation does not last more than necessary.

Under normal circumstances, the review process lasts up to four weeks, and only exceptionally up to three months. The total period from the submission of a manuscript until its publication takes an average of 90 days.

During the review process, the Editor-in-Chief may require authors to provide additional information (including raw data) if they are necessary for the evaluation of the manuscript. These materials shall be kept confidential and must not be used for any other purposes.

Resolving inconsistencies

In the case that the authors have serious and reasonable objections to the reviews, the Editorial Board makes an assessment of whether a review is objective and whether it meets academic standards. If there is a doubt about the objectivity or quality of review, the Editor-in-Chief will assign additional reviewer(s).

Additional reviewers may also be assigned when reviewers' decisions (accept or reject) are contrary to each other or otherwise substantially incompatible. The final decision on the acceptance of the manuscript for publication rests solely with the Editorial board.