



ISSN 2453-8035
Editor-in-Chief
Prof. Nataliya Panasenko, DrSc.
University of SS Cyril and Methodius in
Trnava,
Slovakia

Nám. Jozefa Herdu, 2
Trnava, 917 01 Slovakia
Website: www.lartis.sk
<http://www.degruyter.com/view/j/LArt>
E-mail: editor@lartis.sk or journal@lartis.sk

Lege Artis Peer Review Policy

The editorial board of LArt views peer review as essential to the publication process, providing independent assessment of the significance of research results thus producing refined manuscripts. Manuscripts are typically sent to two independent reviewers. The editorial board of the Journal is grateful to all reviewers who contribute their time, knowledge and efforts for evaluating manuscripts. The journal uses a double-blind reviewing process, thus authors remain anonymous to referees and referees remain anonymous to authors. Based on reviewers' advice, our editors decide if the article is published, returned for revisions, or rejected.

Reviewers should provide detailed, constructive comments to help both the associate editor to make a decision on the manuscript and the author(s) to improve the manuscript. Reviewers should clearly state if the manuscript has (serious) flaws, additional experiments or data are required or a potential conflict of interest could exist.

Reviewers are asked to select a recommendation from a drop down list and to answer several specific questions by making a selection from a list of options. Blind comments to the author(s) and confidential comments to the associate editor can be written in boxes.

Evaluation Criteria	Yes	No
The TITLE matches the contents of the paper		
The article fits the stated SCOPE of the journal		
The INTRODUCTION previews the main points of the paper		
The paper is well organized according to the		

AUTHOR GUIDELINES of the journal and makes original contribution		
The paper is based on sound METHODOLOGY		
The CLAIMS are novel and convincing		
The claims are appropriately discussed in the context of latest LITERATURE		
The article contains significant ANALYSIS and sufficient FINDINGS, which support objectives of the paper		
The TABLES AND FIGURES (if any) are clear and useful, properly placed with the appropriate sources		
The author(s) follow the proper structure in writing the English RÉSUMÉ of the paper		
The list of KEY WORDS properly highlights the contents of the paper		

Decision Tick mark to be given below in support of the decision

Accept the paper in its current format ✓

Accept the paper with the minor changes

Resubmit with the major changes

Decline the submission

Reviewers help editors make publication decisions by indicating how to strengthen a paper. Negative reviews should explain weaknesses, so rejected authors can improve the manuscript for publication elsewhere. Referees need not provide detailed advice, but the author should know why the manuscript is unsuitable. Confidential comments to the editor are welcome, but main points should be stated in comments to the authors.

The ideal review should answer the following questions:

- Who will the paper interest, and why?
- How is the paper better than others in its field?
- Would other references strengthen the manuscript?
- Would further work improve it? How difficult and time-consuming would it be?

- If the manuscript is unacceptable, is the study promising?
- What improvements would make a promising manuscript acceptable?

Specific comments to author:

Please include specific comments to be sent to the authors, using as much space as necessary. Please be as constructive as possible and include clear and specific suggestions, stating which aspects of the manuscript must/should be improved, along with your rationale.

Timeline: We ask reviewers to return their reports within 30 days or to inform the managing editor as soon as possible if more time is needed.

The Journal is participating in a growing community of CrossCheck System's users in order to ensure that the content published is original and trustworthy. CrossCheck is a medium that allows for comprehensive manuscript screening, aimed to eliminate plagiarism and provide a high standard and quality peer-review process. Anyhow, reviewers should alert the editors if they suspect any misconduct (such as plagiarism) by the author(s).

For any questions regarding the journal and the review process, feel free to contact the Managing Editors.