



GUIDE FOR REVIEWERS

The purpose of peer review is to improve the scientific quality of manuscripts that will potentially be published. The task of the peer reviewer is to critically evaluate the manuscript and to give fair, constructive and consistent proposals for improving the quality of the manuscript he is reviewing.

Reviewer's responsibility. Reviews should be objective and fair. Criticism and discrimination of authors for personal reasons are unacceptable. In the event that there is a conflict of interest arising from cooperation with the authors or institutions on which the research was carried out, the reviewer should avoid this assignment. The reviewer should respect the discretion of the manuscript, should not discuss it with colleagues or use information from the manuscript in any way.

This journal uses a single blind review process, which means that the reviewers are anonymous to the authors, but they know who the authors are. All correspondence with reviewers takes place via e-mail. We ask reviewers to respond to the Editor's call as soon as possible. If they cannot accept, they are asked to suggest other experts in the field as potential reviewers. The Editor's final decision on whether or not to accept the manuscript is largely based on the reviewers' reports.

Upon completion of the review, the reviewer should complete the BMS Review report form, in which he / she provides comments to the editor, comments to the authors, evaluation and recommendation for publication.

Comments for the Editor

Within these comments, the reviewer should answer the questions asked and, if he/she wishes, makes specific comments that he/she considers relevant to his/her assessment and recommendation regarding publication.

Comments for authors

Comments should be clear, constructive and substantiated, and as detailed as possible.

It is necessary to give a general assessment of the manuscript about its strengths, weaknesses and relevance, its originality and importance to the field of research. Specific comments should include the following questions:

- Is the topic of manuscript within the BMS scope? Is the information relevant to the broad readership of the Journal? Does the manuscript present new information that contributes to the expansion of knowledge in the field?
- Do the title, abstract, keywords, introduction and conclusions accurately represent the main ideas of the manuscript?
- Is the presentation clear, concise, interesting and repetitive?
- Are the goals clearly stated?
- Are the methods used appropriately, accurately and clearly enough described that other researchers can repeat the conducted investigation?
- Are the reported results supported by data? Can they be easily checked by inspecting tables and figures? Are there any repetitions?
- Are all tables and figures necessary, clearly marked, well conceived and easy to interpret?
- Are the conclusions based on the presented data and results?
- Do the cited references really support the conducted research? Are key references in the field missing?
- Does the size of the manuscript match its content? Are there parts of the manuscript that need to be expanded, condensed, combined or removed?
- Have the appropriate publishing permits been obtained?
- Is the manuscript written in accordance with the Instructions for Authors?

Reviewers are asked to comment on potential irregularities such as:

- Are the data or results presented in the manuscript already published or in press? If so, we ask reviewers to provide details;
- Did the author plagiarize another publication?
- Is there an indication that the data is fabricated or that it has been handled inappropriately?

Reviewer's recommendation

As part of the recommendations, reviewers should opt for one of the options offered:

- Accept in present form
- Major revision required
- Minor revision required
- Reject

The completed BMS Review report form is sent to the Editor, who forwards the part Comments to Author to the authors. At the end of the completed process, the Editor forwards all the reviews and the final decision to the reviewers.