GUIDELINES FOR REVIEWERS

As a peer-reviewed journal, we perform quality control for submitted manuscripts. The peer review process represents a vital element of maintaining high standards in scholarly publishing. This process could not be managed without knowledge and experience of contributing specialists. We appreciate the time and effort all our reviewers spend evaluating manuscripts for the Medical University.

GENERAL EXPECTATIONS

While preparing the reports, we ask our Referees to:

- comment on originality of the presented work
- evaluate authors’ approach to the discussed problem
- evaluate reliability of obtained results and correctness of drawn conclusions
- comment on artistic and 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

The majority of Sciendo journals and books use a closed single-blind peer review system (the names of the reviewers are hidden from the authors). Submitted manuscripts are reviewed by two or more experts. Reviewers are asked to recommend whether a manuscript should be accepted, revised or rejected. All Sciendo journals use the plagiarism screening tool CrossCheck/iThenticate, but we are most grateful to reviewers who kindly alert the editors if they suspect any issues relating to such authors’ misconduct such as plagiarism if they are willing.

Reviewers are asked to provide detailed, constructive comments that will help both the editors make a decision on the publication and the author(s) to improve their manuscript. They should point out whether the work has serious flaws that preclude its publication, or whether additional experiments should be carried out or additional data should be collected to support the conclusions drawn.

Reviewers invited by the editors should reveal any potential conflict of interest they may have with respect to the manuscript or the authors. All likely personal, professional or financial conflicts of interest should be considered. For more details please refer to the De Gruyter Publication Ethics and Publication Malpractice Statement.

SPECIFIC EXPECTATIONS

When preparing the reports, we ask our reviewers to consider the following points:

**Originality and significance of the presented work**

Reviewers are asked to comment on the originality and significance of the work for the scientific community. The main result is not published elsewhere in any medium neither by the authors nor somebody else, and is not currently under consideration for publication in any other medium. This restriction does not apply to review articles. If the presented research is unoriginal and similar work has been published previously, reviewers should give references.
Focus on the core aims and scope of the journal

MEDU is a scientific medical journal publishing research results from all fields of medical education, simulation technology, molecular and translational medicine, pharmaceutical economics and management.

Experimental or theoretical approach to the discussed problem

As experts in the relevant field, reviewers are asked to discuss the novelty of theoretical approaches and experimental methods presented in the manuscript.

Strengths and weaknesses of the methods used

Reviewers should assess the appropriateness of the methods used. If necessary, technical aspects of the paper, such as the statistical analyses, should be commented. They should suggest improvements that will result in the enhancement of the quality of the paper.

Reliability of the results and validity of the conclusions

Reviewers are requested to comment on the reliability of new methods developed. They should consider whether the conclusion(s) drawn are supported by the data collected.

Organisation of the manuscript

Reviewers should comment whether the manuscript is easy to read and the arguments are described in a logical and understandable way. They should suggest improvements, if necessary.

Articles submitted to the Medical University must be clearly and correctly written, contain all essential features of a complete scientific paper and be readable for a wide audience of individuals associated with medical education, simulation technology, molecular and translational medicine, pharmaceutical economics and management

Discussion of the most relevant literature on the topic

Reviewers should comment on the relevance of literature cited in the manuscript. They should give reference to any important research not mentioned in the paper or in the book proposal.

REVISIONS

When revision of the manuscript is suggested, reviewers are asked to recommend which aspects of the work should be improved: better motivation for the research, additional data to confirm conclusions, better organisation of the paper or the manuscript.

Please note that, if necessary, accepted manuscripts will undergo language editing by native English speakers. Incorrect grammar, style or punctuation should not constitute a sufficient reason to reject a paper if it is still intelligible for the reviewer and its content warrants publication from a scientific point of view.

PUBLICATION FORMATS

Research Paper

A research paper should report original research results in all aforementioned areas of medicine included in the journal scope. It should be organised using the following sections: Abstract, Keywords, Introduction, Methods, Results, Discussion, Acknowledgments (if applicable, these can be included in the cover letter to...
facilitate double-blind review if necessary), Conflict of interest statement, References, Figure Legends and Table Captions, Tables, Figures and Supplemental data (if applicable).

**Review Paper**

Review paper should contain the most significant results of the subject under review. It should describe the most relevant and recent contributions, the subject matter should be discussed competently and the choice of citations should be adequate.

**Letter to the Editor and Amendments**

It could present discussion, review or re-analysis of the paper published in MEDU.

**CONFIDENTIALITY**

Please do not distribute copies of the manuscript or use results contained in it without the authors’ permission. However, please feel free to show it to knowledgeable colleagues and to consult them about the review. Suggestions for alternative reviewers are helpful to the editors and would be appreciated.

**TECHNICALITIES**

Please return your report within the specified deadline or inform the Editor as soon as possible if you are not able to do so. You can submit your review via the online submission system.

In the specific cases (upon special arrangement with the Editor) reports can be returned as a hard copy via mail or fax. If you are using Editorial Manager you will be able to access all necessary information on the Web. In order to reach a manuscript you have been asked to review, please go to the website of the Editorial Manager http://www.editorialmanager.com/

The Editorial Manager Reviewers tutorial is available on this page. In order to log on to the system you need to use the login info generated by the system and sent to you by the Editor. The same message contains link to manuscript abstract. You will access the full manuscript after choosing “agreement for review”.
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