**Gudielines for reviewers**

Reviewers assist the Editorial Board in making the editorial decision and they help the author with the aim of improving the quality of the manuscript. They express their opinion on the quality of the article in the form of a short evaluation with the following criteria: A – accept, no changes suggested, B – accept, after making changes as specified in this review, C – before accepting, significant changes or major revisions of the article are required, D – reject. Reviewers suggest categorization of the article as follows: original scientific paper, preliminary communication, review paper, and professional paper. The Journal publishes only peer-reviewed articles categorized as original scientific paper, preliminary communication, and review paper.

During the review process, reviewers shall respect the publishing ethics of the Journal and be completely objective. Reviewers shall point out reasoned objective comments accompanying their opinion but shall not express any personal criticism of the submitted manuscripts. Reviewers shall suggest relevant data sources that the author has potentially not cited in the paper. Reviewers are required to promptly notify the Editor if they discover overlaps between the manuscript being reviewed and any other publication. Reviewers shall treat manuscripts submitted for review as confidential documents.

**Review guidelines:**

1. **Title –** Is it in accordance with the content of the article?
2. **Methodology –** Is it in accordance with the research object?
3. **Professional terminology** – Is it well-chosen and appropriately used?
4. **Mistakes –** Are there any mistakes in the theoretical part, data processing and
interpretation, or graphs?
5. **Uniformity**– Are the individual parts of the paper of appropriate length?
6. **Repetition**– Are there any unnecessary repetitions (if so, where and which ones)?
7. **Clarity**– Is the text written clearly and logically (without contradictions)?
8. **Conclusion**– Is the conclusion logical? Do the conclusions come from the obtained
results?
9. **References**– Are they relevant and properly cited?