PJFNS Instructions for Reviewers

Reviews are confidential, meaning that Authors do not know the names of Reviewers. Authors receive Review form (without Reviewer’s signature) and Reviewers Comments to Authors. Reviewers Comments to Editor are confidential to Author.

The review should provide in-depth evaluation of strengths and drawbacks of the manuscript. Please answer the questions from review form, then give your specific comments on the manuscript, and finally add your final recommendation.

In that case of answering NO/POOR to any question in the Review form, please provide your remarks in the Comments to Authors field.

Reviewer Rating Questions (1 = no/poor, 2 = moderately/fair, 3 = yes/very good)

A ) Does the subject fall within the scope of PJFNS?
B ) Is the title concise and corresponding to the contents of the manuscript?
C ) Are all Key words necessary and informative?
D ) Does Abstract contain brief information on the objective, results and conclusions of the study?
E ) Does the Introduction section provide concise description of problems and objectives of the study?
F ) Is the aim of the work clearly stated?
G ) Are experimental details and methods appropriately described to allow other to repeat the experiments?
H ) Is the experimental design appropriate?
I ) Are there adequate controls and sampling, and are they described in the manuscript?
J ) Did the Authors use reliable and up-to-date methods?
K ) Were the results elaborated and described concisely?
L ) Were the results properly analysed?
M ) Were the results statistically analysed?
N ) Were the results discussed in view of literature data?
O ) Are the Conclusions justified by the results?
P ) Are the References up-to-date and properly selected?
Q ) Are all the references cited necessary?
R ) Are there any papers published in PJFNS cited in References?
S ) Are all Tables and Figures necessary?
T ) Are all Tables and Figures clearly presented and organised?
U ) Are titles and legends of Tables and Figures correct and clear?
V ) Is the study original?
W ) Does the study contribute new knowledge to the field?
X ) What is the technical quality of work?
Y ) What is the clarity of presentation?
**Additional questions (please answer: „Yes” or „No”)**

Is there clear evidence of plagiarism, simultaneous submission to another journal or was the manuscript previously published?

Is there clear evidence of conflict of interest?

Are there concerns in experimental animals treatment?

**Reviewer’s decision on manuscript (please state your decision below by choosing from: Accept, Minor revision, Major revision, Reject).**

Reviewer’s decision: ……. 

**Reviewer’s comments to manuscript:**