



PRENATAL CARDIOLOGY

KARDIOLOGIA PRENATALNA - ECHO PŁODU

Reviewer

GUIDELINES FOR REVIEWERS

Peer review represents a vital element of maintaining high standards in scholarly publishing. This process could not be managed without the knowledge and experience of contributing specialists. We appreciate the time and effort all our reviewers spend evaluating manuscripts for Prenatal Cardiology, De Gruyter Open journal.

General Expectations

The majority of the Prenatal Cardiology journal 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. The Prenatal Cardiology journal use the plagiarism screening tool [CrossCheck/iThenticate](#), but it is reviewers who should alert the editors if they suspect any issues relating to author misconduct such as plagiarism.

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:

1. Originality and significance of presented work.

Reviewers are asked to comment on the originality and significance of the work for the scientific community. If the presented research is unoriginal and similar work has been published previously, reviewers should give references.

2. Experimental or theoretical approach to the discussed problem(s).

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

3. 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.

4. 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.

5. Organization 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.

6. 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.

7. 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 organization 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.

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 email to the Editorial Office or via online submission system.