

## **The procedure of reviewing articles submitted to the Journal.**

1. All the research articles submitted to the Journal are reviewed according to the established procedure.
2. The Board of Editors decides whether the article is relevant to the scope of the journal, whether it meets the requirements for the formulation standards, and afterwards allocates it to the Managing Secretary of the Journal who determined the research significance of the manuscript and appoints the reviewer. The articles are reviewed by the Associate Editors and the Members of Editorial Board and also by the external reviewers being the leading specialists, working in the specific field relevant to the subject of the article.
3. Reviewing is accomplished anonymously. The author of the article shall be referred to the reviewers' reports and comments.
4. The review is accomplished within 3 weeks. This period is controlled by the Board of Editors, in case of certain circumstances and on the reviewer's request it can be prolonged.
5. In order to get a full and objective report of the article, the Editors have designed special Guidelines for Reviewers, comprising a list of questions. The way these questions are covered and highlighted in the article is to be assessed by the reviewer. On the basis of this assessment the reviewer makes the final decision on the manuscript: 1) the article is accepted for publishing a) with no corrections needed; b) after revision of the reviewer's comments and marked flaws; 2) the article is given to some other reviewer for a supplementary report; 3) the article is rejected.
6. If the reviewer's report contains any recommendations and comments for further revision and corrections, Head of the Editorial Board makes the author familiar with the reviewer's report and the suggestions on the improving and corrections needed for the research article. The author is to either accept the recommendations and submit a revised version of the article or present partial or complete sound argument on rejecting the comments. The revised and corrected article is referred to revision once again.
7. If the author and the reviewer have come to critical contradictions according to the article, the Board of Editors shall refer the article for further review to another reviewer. In conflict situations the article may be referred to one of the members of the Editorial Board. The final decision in such cases is taken by the Editor in Chief.

8. The article rejected on the reviewer's decision is not accepted for reviewing for the second time. The decision on rejection of the article is mailed, faxed or sent to the author by post.
9. Positive review on the article is not sufficient for the decision on the suitability of the article for publication. The final decision on publication is taken by the Board of Editors based on the sound scientific reasoning of the article and its relevance to the subject scope of the Journal. In conflict situations the decision is taken by the Editor in Chief. The decision is stated in the protocol of the meetings of the Editorial Board.
10. The original reviewers' reports on the articles are kept in the Editorial Office during three years.

## **Guidelines for reviewers**

Reviews are to provide constructive feedback to authors on ways to improve their writing and effectiveness in reaching the Journal readers. When reviewing an article, reviewers are expected to address the following:

- 1) What are the main claims of the paper and how significant are they? Are these claims novel?
- 2) Are the claims properly placed in the context of the previous literature?
- 3) Is the paper scientifically sound? Does it take the discussion and debate on this topic in a novel direction?
- 4) Is the paper important in its discipline? Is the topic investigated by the article significant and timely?
- 5) Is the focus of the article clearly stated (for instance, the problem, issue, or object under investigation; the research question; or the theoretical problem)? Is it well supported by the data and analyses?
- 6) Does the article offer enough details of its methodology that its experiments or its analyses could be reproduced?
- 7) Are the experimental or theoretical methods selected and explained adequately?
- 8) Do the authors give sufficient and adequate statistics to support each point?
- 9) Are the results presented clearly and concisely? Are all main points and conclusions relevant to the matter discussed or questioned by the authors?
- 10) Do the authors give an adequate and relevant evidence analysis?
- 11) Are the conclusions drawn from the data, texts, sources, or represented objects clear and justified?
- 12) Is the article of importance to researchers in the field or outside the field?
- 13) Will the article have an impact upon practitioners (clinicians and health policymakers)?
- 14) Are all the figures and tables relevant and well-constructed? Are the captions appropriate and informative?

- 15) Does the article make necessary and appropriate connections of the results received with the existing data?
- 16) If the article is based on previous research, how is this research referenced? Are these references accurate and all the important works properly mentioned?
- 17) Does the abstract adequately summarize the contents of the paper?
- 18) Is the work conducted according to the highest ethical standards?