

Listy klinické logopedie

časopis Asociace klinických logopedů ČR, ISSN 2570-6179

ETHICAL CODEX FOR REVIEWERS

Dear Reviewer,

If you have been approached as a reviewer of an article in our journal, know that you have been selected by an Editor based on your expertise and experience. However, it is possible that the specific topic of the article is on the fringes of your professional interest. Therefore, please let us know if you have any doubts about your ability to review the article, before accepting the review invitation.

Our journal works in a double-blind review mode, which means that neither the author nor the reviewer knows each other's identity throughout the process. At least two reviewers are invited to review each article. A third reviewer is contacted if the two previous reviewers differ fundamentally in their conclusions and recommendations.

The coordinator of the review procedure is the Editor of the article; the entire review procedure takes place electronically in the Actavia Content Management System.

If you accept a request for a review, you undertake to make an impartial assessment of the submitted article. Therefore, let us know in advance if you are aware of a potential conflict of interest in relation to the article (this may be, for example, a conflict of interest at the personal, financial or professional level).

It is important that you acquaint the responsible Editor with facts such as:

- you know who the author is of the blinded article
- you are working on the same project as the author of the article

In such a case, the request for review of the article will most likely be withdrawn by the Editor.

You should also not agree to review a manuscript merely to read it, without intending to submit a review.

Likewise, you should not agree to review a manuscript that is very similar to a manuscript that you plan to write yourself for another journal.

If, for any reason, you are unable to accept the review request, we would be grateful if you could suggest another reviewer.

Please adhere to the deadlines for submitting the review report to the online editorial system.

Respect the confidentiality of the review process and do not use the information obtained during this process for your own or someone else's use or to the benefit of others. Do not involve anyone else in the manuscript review, without first obtaining the permission of the Editor who is coordinating the entire review process.

Should you encounter discrepancies regarding research ethics and publication ethics when reviewing an article, please notify the Editor immediately.

Submit your review in the online Review Form on our journal's website. You will be asked to evaluate the text in the following areas: title, abstract, keywords, introduction, objectives, hypotheses, methodology, results, discussion, conclusion, literature, pictures, tables, language and relevance of the text. You will also be able to enter an anonymous comment, which will be sent to the reviewer along with the completed Review Form. At the end of your review, you will be asked by the Content Management System to indicate whether:

- you recommend publication of the article
- you recommend publication of the article with minor revisions
- you recommend publication of the article after major revision
- you recommend that the article be rejected

If minor or major revision is recommended, the article always undergoes a second round of the review process. You will be informed about this second round via an automatic e-mail message from the Content Management System. This second round does not take place in the case of a reviewer having recommended only "minor revision" and explicitly stating that he/she does not want to see the article again after the author makes the minor adjustments.

When reviewing, be objective and specific, providing feedback to assist authors to improve the manuscript. Be professional and refrain from hostile or ironic comments.

On the Review Form, you will also have the opportunity to write an account which will be visible only to the Editor of the article. Confidential comments to the Editor should not be the place for defamation or false accusations, knowing that the author/s will not see your comments.

Remember, this is the author's article, so do not try to rewrite it in your own language style. However, proposals for changes that will improve the clarity and comprehensibility of the text are important.

Likewise, it is not your task to expand the work beyond its current scope.

Abstain from suggestions that authors cite your (or co-worker's) work, only to increase the number of your citations or to make your work visible.