

## Instructions for Reviewers

As peer-review journal, the **Bulletin of the Polish Academy of Sciences: Technical Sciences (Bull. Pol. Ac.: Tech.)** performs the quality control for submitted manuscripts by review process.

### Review process:

- When a manuscript is received on Editorial Manager, the Editor-in-Chief (EiC) and Assistant to the EiC are automatically notified by e-mail.
- The Assistant to the EiC check for proper format and the scope and assigns the manuscript to a Topical Editor (TE) that will be responsible for conducting the peer review.
- The TE then selects a minimum of two subject-matter experts to review the manuscript.
- Upon completion of manuscript review, each reviewer completes two detailed evaluations - one for the EiC and TE, and one for the author(s).
- When all reviews are completed, the TE collects review comments, coordinates the comments, drafts a recommendation based upon reviewer recommendations and personal evaluation of the manuscript, and forwards the recommendation to the EiC for final editorial decision.
- The EiC reviews the recommendation along with reviewer comments, arrives at a final decision, and notifies the Corresponding Author (the author that submitted the manuscript for review) of the results of the review.

### General expectations

While preparing the reports, we ask our Referees to:

- comment on originality of presented work, in relation to most recent literature on a topic discussed,
- evaluate proposed approach to discussed problem,
- evaluate obtained results and correctness of withdrawn conclusions,
- comment on technical aspects of paper,
- give the final evaluation of paper, inform us whether we should consider it further and what should be done in order to make it publishable (if it is possible),
- give us an idea of possible impact that the paper might have,
- if in your opinion the work has been published or submitted elsewhere, or that plagiarism has occurred, please inform us immediately and provide us with sufficient information to investigate the matter further

Please note that accepted papers will undergo a language check service, for correcting small language mistakes. Therefore, incorrect grammar, style or punctuation should not be the reason to reject a paper if its content is important for publication from the scientific point of view and is readable for the Reviewer.

Please provide your report within specified deadline or inform the Topical Editor if you are not able to do so.

### Manuscript decision:

Manuscript evaluations are assigned one of four outcomes:

- *Accept*,
- *Minor Revisions*,
- *Major Revisions*,
- *Reject*.

Clearly, the review process results in an extremely low percentage of submitted manuscripts receiving an "Accept" evaluation on the first review. Most manuscripts require revision! Manuscripts requiring "Minor Revision" not require a second review. All manuscripts receiving a "Major Revision" evaluation must be subjected to a second review. Where possible, the same TE and reviewers will be used to accomplish the second review to ensure consistency between the initial review and the second review. Rejected manuscripts are given no further consideration. Normally, manuscripts that receive a "Major Revision" decision have only one additional chance for revision and the revised version should be uploaded to the Editorial Manager within six weeks. If the author(s) failed to make satisfactory changes in the manuscript, the manuscript is rejected.

**Confidentiality**

Please, do not distribute copies of the manuscript or use results contained in without authors' permission. Please do not pass on the paper to another referee without notifying us. If you are unable to assess the paper, please return it immediately; your suggestions for alternative referees would be welcome. Your name will not be disclosed to the author(s).