бул. „Хр. Смирненски“ № 1, София 1046, Р България, e-mail: annual@uacg.bg

GUIDELINES TO REVIEWERS

REVIEW

Manuscripts submitted to the Annual of the UACEG are reviewed by **one** reviewer.

Each faculty editor of the Annual appoints a reviewer who is competent in the relevant scientific field of the submitted paper. The faculty editor compiles and maintains a list of reviewers.

Reviewers must hold a doctoral degree, have recent publications in the scientific field of the submitted manuscript, and have not published joint papers with the authors in the last three years.

The faculty editor (editor-in-chief) sends each submitted paper, along with the review form in the relevant language, to the reviewer of his/her choice.

The review process is organized in such a way that the authors are not informed of the name of the reviewer, and the reviewer is not informed of the names of the authors. The review is available only to the editors. The reviewers assess the quality of the manuscript and suggest to the faculty editor whether or not the manuscript should be accepted, corrected (and in what form) or rejected. The review period is **fourteen** days.

The reviewers' responsibilities are:

- to promptly accept or decline the invitation for review based on the manuscript title and abstract;
- if the invitation is declined, to suggest alternative reviewers, if possible;
- to review the manuscript's bibliography and check for inappropriate citations and self-citations;
- to provide a detailed and constructive review;
- to assess:
  - *originality* (Is the paper new, original, and is its purpose well defined? Do the results advance current knowledge?);
  - *significance* (Are the results interpreted appropriately? Are they significant? Are all conclusions justified and supported by the results? Are hypotheses and speculations carefully identified as such?);
  - *quality and scientific validity* (Is the paper written in an appropriate manner? Are the data and analyses presented in an appropriate manner? Are the highest standards for presenting the results used? Is the research technically sound? Are the analyses performed to current technical standards? Are the data reliable enough to draw conclusions? Are the methods, apparatus, software, and reagents described in sufficient detail to allow another researcher to reproduce the results?);
  - *potential interest for readers* (Are the conclusions interesting to the journal's readership? Will the paper attract a wide readership, or will it be of interest only to a limited number of people?);
  - *the level of the English language* of the manuscript (Is the English understandable?);
- provide an overall recommendation for publication of the manuscript:
  - *acceptance as is*: The paper is accepted without further changes;
  - *acceptance after minor revisions*: The paper is generally accepted after revisions based on the reviewer's comments. Authors are given seven days to make minor revisions;

– *reconsideration after major revisions*: The acceptance of the manuscript will depend on the revisions made. Authors must provide a response to all points of the review or provide a rebuttal if any of the reviewer's comments cannot or should not be revised. Authors are given **fourteen** days to resubmit the revised document so that the revised version can be returned to the reviewer for additional comments;
– *rejection*: The paper has serious shortcomings, does not make an original contribution. It is rejected without a proposal for resubmission to the journal.

Reviews should be brief, highlighting the novelty and contributions of the paper, and should contain an overall assessment, specific comments, and recommendations. They should include:

• a brief summary (one short paragraph) outlining the purpose of the paper and the main scientific contributions;

• general comments highlighting the strengths and weaknesses of the manuscript. These comments should also be specific enough to allow the authors to respond;

• specific comments regarding line numbers, tables, or figures;

• the reasons for accepting/correcting/rejecting the paper.

Unsubstantiated reviews will not be accepted.

Potential conflict of interests

Reviewers should quickly inform the faculty editor of any conflict of interest that may affect the review, either positively or negatively. Reviewers who are invited to review a manuscript that they have previously reviewed for another journal and rejected should not consider this to be a conflict of interest. In such cases, reviewers should inform the faculty editor whether or not the manuscript has been improved compared to the previous version.

Confidentiality and Anonymity

Reviewers must keep the contents of the manuscript, including the abstract, confidential. Reviewers should be careful not to reveal their identity to the authors (in case they guess who they are) through comments or recommendations. In all cases, reviews are considered confidential and will not be disclosed, except in cases of legal proceedings or plagiarism, but only with the express permission of the reviewer.