

INSTRUCTIONS FOR REVIEWERS

PART ONE: OBLIGATIONS OF THE REVIEWER

Reviewers are required to submit to the editor a professional, well-grounded, impartial and prompt assessment of the scientific value of the manuscript. The deadline for submission of the assessment of the scientific value of the manuscript is 15 days.

Reviewers evaluate the compliance of the topic of the papers with the profile of the Journal, the relevance of the research area and applied methods, the originality and scientific relevance of the data presented in the manuscript, the style of scientific presentation, and to what degree the text is equipped with figures, tables and graphs.

Reviewers who have founded suspicions or knowledge of an ethical standards violation by the author are required to inform the editor of this. Reviewers should identify important published papers that the authors have not cited. They should also warn the editor of significant similarities and overlapping between the manuscript under consideration and any other published work or manuscript that is in the process of being reviewed by another journal, if they have personal knowledge about it. Also, if the same manuscript is being considered by several journals at the same time, reviewers are required to inform the editor.

Reviewers must not have any conflict of interest with the authors or funders of the research. If there is, reviewers are required to immediately inform the editor of this fact.

Reviewers who consider themselves unqualified in the topic or area addressed by the manuscript are required to inform the editor of this fact.

Reviews must be unbiased. Comments concerning the author's person are considered inappropriate. The reviewer's judgement must be clear and supported by arguments.

Manuscripts sent to the reviewers are considered confidential documents. Reviewers may not use unpublished material from submitted manuscripts for their research without the express written permission of the authors, and information and ideas presented in submitted manuscripts must be kept confidential and may not be used for personal gain.

PART TWO: REVIEW PROCEDURE

All received manuscripts are subjected to peer review. The goal of the review is to help the editor decide whether to accept or reject the manuscript, as well as to improve the quality of the manuscripts through the process of communication with the authors.

Reviews are anonymous; the identities of the authors are unknown to the reviewers and vice versa.

Authors are required to provide contact information (including email addresses) and an area of expertise for three potential reviewers. These proposed reviewers should be experts in the given research field, relevant to the manuscript, and should not be members of the same research or academic institution as the authors. Reviewers proposed by authors are considered along with other potential reviewers selected based on their publications or recommended by members of the Editorial Board. However, the final decision on the selection of reviewers lies with the editor, without any obligation to contact any of the reviewers suggested by the authors. Also, the authors may list three potential reviewers whom they do not want reviewing their manuscript, which the editor will respect.

Manuscripts will be submitted for two independent reviews, and reviewers will be asked to assess whether the manuscript is technically and scientifically valid and correct, as well as whether the quality of writing is acceptable. Reviewers should complete the Reviewer Form, which facilitates the reviewing of the manuscript.

The editor's final decision will be made based on the recommendation of the reviewers, provided that both recommendations are in agreement and without considerable differences. In cases where there are opposing views, the paper is evaluated by a third reviewer who may or may not be a member of the Editorial Board. Once all reviews have been received and considered, a final decision is passed by the Editor and submitted in writing to the author.

PART THREE: CALL FOR REVIEW

THE EDITOR EXPECTS YOUR EXPERT ASSISTANCE FOR THE FINAL DECISION ON THE PUBLICATION OF THE SUBMITTED MANUSCRIPT

The Editorial Board of the Journal sends an invitation to review the manuscript, including a copy of the abstract.

If the reviewer accepts the invitation to review the paper, the Editorial Board sends them the Reviewer Form, as well as the manuscript or a link granting them access to the full text.

Upon completion of the assessment, reviewers are required to send it by email to casopis@rlkbg.org.rs or to visit the online submission system and submit their comments.

If a reviewer agrees to review the manuscript, they need to confirm that there is no conflict of interest that may affect the impartial assessment of the quality of the manuscript.

The manuscript review process is a confidential process.

The reviewer's assessment is expected within 15 days.

Reviewer comments should be submitted in the form of:

- statement of opinion in the **Reviewer Form**;
- comments to be sent directly to the authors and co-reviewers; and
- confidential comments reserved for the editors.

The basic assessment of the manuscript includes:

- checking compliance with the basic scope and all the Journal's criteria for submitting a manuscript;
- pointing out and commenting on the main values and weaknesses of the manuscript;
- commenting the study design, methods, and presentation of results;
- commenting the interpretation of data, conclusions, and possible limitations of the study;
- pointing out ethical issues; and
- providing constructive and useful suggestions to the authors.

Comments relating to the authors should be expressed in an objective and neutral tone. Constructive thinking/criticism is expected. It is useful to include an opening paragraph that summarizes the crucial presented findings and provides the main suggestions/comments and minor comments, if and where appropriate. It is recommended to enumerate the comments, since this helps the authors, as well as the editor's evaluation. Finally, provide a recommendation regarding the suitability of the manuscript for publication.