

REVIEWER'S CODE OF ETHICS

1. The reviewer updates his knowledge on the publishing policy of the journal.
2. The reviewer undertakes to review only the articles that can be assessed according to his knowledge, competence and experience.
3. The reviewer does not accept to review articles which are the result of research very similar to those which he is currently conducting.
4. The reviewer performs the review personally. He does not engage other scientists in the reviewing process.
5. The reviewer's comments should clearly refer to the article. General and inaccurate statements should be avoided.
6. The reviewer respects the style and method of communication of the author, if it is correct and transparent. He does not force to adapt a style to suit his preferences.
7. Suggesting the citation of own works or works of the reviewer's colleagues, in order to increase own rate of citation or for other personal gain, is unacceptable.
8. The reviewer performs the review as objectively as possible. Justification of the review is factual, clear, and the recommendation unambiguous.
9. The reviewer does not know the identity of the author of the reviewed article.
10. If the reviewer guesses the identity of the author of the article and there is a potential conflict of interest, he shall immediately inform the journal's editorial board of this fact.
11. The reviewer's personal beliefs due to religious or political views or resulting from his nationality or sexual orientation do not have an impact on the content and outcome of the review.
12. The reviewer refuses to perform a review if he is not able to provide an attitude of impartiality.
13. The reviewer does not in any way use the articles entrusted to him for review.
14. The reviewer maintains confidentiality of the review, does not disclose the results of studies or other content of the reviewed article, both during and after performing the review.
15. The reviewer performs the review within the prescribed period. He informs the editorial board of any possible delays.
16. The reviewer informs the editorial board of the suspicion of plagiarism or other abuse.