INSTRUCTIONS FOR REVIEWERS AND THE REVIEW FORM

1. **Assessment of papers.** The paper is assessed by two competent reviewers. Reviewers do not know the author's identity and the author will not recognise the identity of the reviewer.

2. **Deadline for delivering reviews.** Reviews should be delivered within **30 days** from receiving the paper.

3. **Additional changes.** If the author re-sends the paper for publishing, he/she is obliged to inform the editorial board in written form about the changes made in the text (number of the page which includes changes and marked places where the changes were made) in accordance with comments and recommendations of the reviewers.

4. **Title of the paper.** It should be clear, informative and at the same time concise, short and it should encompass and reflect the subject of the paper, i.e. the particularity of the nature of research, interrelatedness of variables and it should be memorable.

5. **Quality of the abstract.** The abstract should include the aim of the paper, the applied research methods, the most significant results and conclusions. Length of the abstract should be between 150–300 words.

6. **Relevance of the paper.** It is estimated according to its focus on research in the areas of teaching and learning at all levels of pedagogical and educational work (from pre-school education to life-long learning) with the aim of their improvement and modernisation.

7. **Conceptual-theoretical framework.** The reviewer estimates whether the author presents the most important scientific facts relevant to the theoretical interpretation of the selected issues and whether the theoretical framework directly serves the purpose of the study and research in question.

8. **Methodological approach.** The reviewer estimates the methodological approach depending on the type of paper and the adequacy of methods applied in data analysis.

Original scientific paper – as a rule, it has to be based on the **IMRAD (Introduction, Methods, Results and Discussion)** scheme for empirical research or on descriptive procedures for descriptive scientific areas.

Systematic review is the review of the latest works on a certain subject or in a field, works of an individual researcher or group of researchers with the aim to **summarise, analyse, evaluate** or

synthesise the published information. It brings new syntheses which must also include the results of the author's own research.

Short scientific paper is the original scientific article which summarises the results of one's original research work or work that is still in progress.

In a **review paper,** the known findings and results of original research are presented, with the aim of spreading information and knowledge as well as their application in praxis. Review papers are written according to scientific methodology requirements and in conformity with the rules of the use of scientific resources. Regarding the structure, they do not differ from scientific papers, but their primary aim is improvement and modernisation of pedagogical and educational praxis.

9. **Elaboration of the results and the conclusion.** The reviewer estimates whether the interpretation of results supports the hypothesis or the tasks set in a precise and reliable manner and based on appropriate arguments. The reviewer also estimates whether the conclusions are systematic and presented in a concise way. Conclusions are used for critical evaluation of the research on the whole – whether the problem of the research is solved as initially planned and whether research aims and tasks were fulfilled.

10. **Literature used.** The list of literature used includes only those works which the author directly refers to in the body of the paper or which have been analysed in the systematic review. The reviewer estimates whether the literature used is relevant for creating a theoretical and conceptual framework and for problem elaboration.

11. **Quality and structure of the text**. Papers should be written concisely, in a comprehensible style and following a logical order. As a rule, it includes an introductory part which ends by stating the aim or the problem of the paper, a description of the methodology applied, an overview of findings, the discussion of results and a conclusion with recommendations for further research or praxis. Apart from this, the reviewer estimates the adequacy of the tables and graphs included in the paper.

12. **Contribution to the scientific field**. The reviewer estimates contribution of the paper to the scientific field that the Periodical concerns – research on the aspects of teaching and learning at all levels of pedagogical and educational work (from pre-school education to life-long learning) with the aim of their improvement and modernisation.

With the alternatives B or C, the reviewer is required to provide a precise explanation and clear recommendations for paper revision. The reviewer also suggests the paper category.

PAPER REVIEW FORM

Please, assess the paper quality according to these indicators by using the following categorisation framework: **A = fully satisfactory; B= satisfactory; C= unsatisfactory**

TITLE OF THE PAPER:	Quality assessment (circle one)
1. **Title adequacy** *Comment/Improvement needed*	**A - B –C**
2. **Abstract quality** (meets the demands stipulated in the instructions)	**A - B –C**
3. **Relevance of the paper for the Periodical** *Comment/Improvement needed*	**A - B –C**
4. **Aim** (aims) **of the paper clearly expressed** *Comment/Improvement needed*	**A - B –C**
5. **Terminological and theoretical framework** (content, size) *Comment/Improvement needed*	**A - B –C**
6. **Methodological approach** *Comment/Improvement needed*	**A - B –C**
7. **Elaboration of the results and conclusions** *Comment/Improvement needed*	**A - B –C**
8. **Literature used**	**A - B –C**
9**. Quality and structure of the text** (clarity, adequate use of tables and graphs) *Comment/Improvement needed*	**A - B –C**
10. **Contribution to the scientific field** of the Periodical (regarding the content, innovation, and methodology) *Comment/Improvement needed*	**A - B –C**
11. *OVERALL ASSESSMENT* (circle the alternative reflecting your opinion and suggest the paper category) **A**= TO BE ACCEPTED **B**= TO BE ACCEPTED UPON REVISION **C**= TO BE REFUSED	

Date _____   Reviewer _____