

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

- **Description** p.1
- **Audience** p.1
- **Editorial Board** p.1
- **Guidelines for Reviewers** p.3

## **DESCRIPTION**

The Strojnícky časopis – Journal of Mechanical Engineering publishes scientific and application oriented papers, dealing with problems of modern technology in the fields of: mechanics, mechatronics, biomechanics, materials, power and process engineering, structural and machine design, production engineering, etc. This considers the following activities in mechanical engineering and cross-linked branches as modelling, rapid prototyping, simulations, construction, testing, measuring, operation, production, environmental aspects, quality, etc.

## **AUDIENCE**

Mechanics, Thermomechanics, Fluid mechanics, Biomechanics, Mechatronics, Materials sciences, Power and Process technology, Transport technology, Production, Computer sciences, engineers.

## **EDITORIAL BOARD**

### **Editor-in-Chief:**

Assoc. Prof. Ing. Branislav Hučko, PhD., Faculty of Mechanical Engineering, Slovak University of Technology in Bratislava, Nám. Slobody 17, 81231 Bratislava, Slovak Republic

### **Executive Editor:**

Assoc. Prof. Roland Jančo, PhD., Institute of Applied Mechanics and Mechatronics, Faculty of Mechanical Engineering, Slovak university of Technology in Bratislava, Slovak Republic

## *Editorial Board*

### **Professor Eniko T. Enikov**

College of Engineering, Aerospace&Mechanical Engineering  
The University of Arizona, USA

### **Professor Siegfried Schmauder**

Institute for Materials Testing, Materials Science and Strength of Materials (IMWF)  
University of Stuttgart, Germany

### **Professor Daniel Inman**

Department of Aerospace Engineering  
University of Michigan, USA

### **Professor Helder C. Rodrigues**

The Mechanical Engineering Department  
Instituto Superior Tecnico, Lisbon, Portugal

### **Professor Thomas J.R. Hughes**

Institute for Computational Engineering and Sciences (ICES)  
The University of Texas at Austin, Austin, Texas, USA

### **Professor Justin Murin**

Institute of Automotive Mechatronics  
Faculty of Electrical Engineering and Information Technology  
Slovak University of Technology in Bratislava, Slovakia

### **Professor Gábor Stépán**

Department of Applied Mechanics  
Budapest University of Technology and Economics (BME)  
Budapest, Hungary

### **Professor Herbert Mang**

Institute for Mechanics of Materials and Structures  
Vienna University of Technology, Vienna, Austria

### **Professor Petr Horyl**

Department of Applied Mechanics  
Faculty of Mechanical Engineering  
VSB - Technical University of Ostrava, Ostrava, Czech Republic

### **Professor Ulrich Gabbert**

Institute of Mechanics  
Chair of Computational Mechanics

Otto von Guericke University  
Magdeburg, Germany

**Professor Marco Ceccarelli**

LARM: Laboratory of Robotics and Mechatronics  
DiCEM – University of Cassino and South Latium  
Cassino, Italy – president of IFToMM

**Professor Evangelos J. Sapountzakis**

National Technical University of Athens  
School of Civil Engineering  
Department of Structural Engineering  
Institute of Structural Analysis and Antiseismic Research, Athens, Greece

The Editorial Board will be completed after the issue number 1, vol. 65, 2015

## **GUIDELINES FOR REVIEWERS**

### *The Responsibility of the Peer Reviewer*

The peer reviewer is responsible for critically reading and evaluating a manuscript in their specialty field, and then providing respectful, constructive, and honest feedback to authors about their submission. It is appropriate for the Peer Reviewer to discuss the strengths and weaknesses of the article, ways to improve the strength and quality of the work, and evaluate the relevance and originality of the manuscript.

### *Before Reviewing*

Please consider the following:

- **Does the article you are being asked to review match your expertise?**

If you receive a manuscript that covers a topic that does not sufficiently match your area of expertise, please notify the editor as soon as possible. Please feel free to recommend alternate reviewer.

- **Do you have time to review the paper?**

Finished reviews of an article should be completed within two weeks. If you do not think you can complete the review within this time frame, please let the editor know and if possible, suggest an alternate reviewer. If you have agreed to review a paper but will no longer be able to finish the work before the deadline, please contact the editor as soon as possible.

- **Are there any potential conflicts of interests?**

While conflicts of interest will not disqualify you from reviewing the manuscript, it is important to disclose all conflicts of interest to the editors before reviewing. If you

have any questions about potential conflicts of interests, please do not hesitate to contact the receiving editorial office.

## *The Review*

When reviewing the article, please keep the following in mind:

- **Content Quality and Originality,**

Is the article sufficiently novel and interesting to warrant publication? Does it add to the canon of knowledge? Does the article adhere to the journal's standards? Is the research question an important one? In order to determine its originality and appropriateness for the journal, it might be helpful to think of the research in terms of what percentile it is in? Is it in the top 25% of papers in this field? You might wish to do a quick literature search using tools such as Scopus to see if there are any reviews of the area. If the research has been covered previously, pass on references of those works to the editor.

- **Organization and Clarity**

The [Peer Review English Form SC JME](#) therefore consists of two parts: the scientific review proper and comments, suggestions, notes of the reviewer. This reviewing form will automatically be sent to all reviewers.

In order to prepare your review, please complete that form and send to email [roland.janco@stuba.sk](mailto:roland.janco@stuba.sk) or [sc-jme@sc-jme.com](mailto:sc-jme@sc-jme.com).

If you need to use formulas, please improvise them in text format or use latex codes if at all possible.

However, if it should be essential to use e.g. extensive formulas or graphics for your review, you can upload these separately.

Also, please prepare the review in such a way that it can be forwarded to the author(s) as the feedback to them. Any further comments intended exclusively for the editors should be prepared as an additional attachment, or in a separate email message. Also, if you prepare your review e.g. in PDF, you may wish to make sure that the parameters of that document do not unintentionally divulge your identity or affiliation.

## *Final Comments*

- All submissions are confidential and please do not discuss any aspect of the submissions with a third party.
- If you would like to discuss the article with a colleague, please ask the editor first.
- Please do not contact the author directly.
- Ethical Issues:
  - Plagiarism: If you suspect that an article is a substantial copy of another work, please let the editor know, citing the previous work in as much detail as possible
  - Fraud: It is very difficult to detect the determined fraudster, but if you suspect the results in an article to be untrue, discuss it with the editor

- Other ethical concerns: For medical research, has confidentiality been maintained? Has there been a violation of the accepted norms in the ethical treatment of animal or human subjects? If so, then these should also be identified to the editor.

### *Confidentiality and Anonymity*

Strict adherence to the following principles is important in order to guarantee the integrity of the reviewing process.

#### *Confidentiality of the Submitted Article*

The contents and the very existence of a submitted manuscript must be considered as confidential until the article is published. If the article is not accepted for the journal, then all aspects of its review in this journal are to be considered as confidential without time limit. Reviewers are requested to adhere to this important principle.

#### *Anonymity of Reviewers*

Authors will not know the identity of the reviewers, unless the reviewer herself chooses to divulge her identity. Reviewers know the identity of the authors. Reviewers normally get to see the other reviews of the same article after they have returned their own review, but will normally not know the identity of the other reviewers. Exceptions to the last rule are sometimes made in case of strongly conflicting reviews, where the reviewers may be invited to interact in order to find out whether this leads one of them to adopt the other one's position on the paper.

Reviewers are of course free to divulge their identity to the authors if they should desire so.

Reviews that are returned as PDF or Word documents may be labeled with the identity of the author of that document in their data field. It is the responsibility of the reviewer to remove such information from the review document before it is returned to the editors, if she wishes to retain her anonymity vis-a-vis the author.

#### *Confidentiality of Reviews*

Reviewers are requested to consider all reviews as confidential. This applies both to the reviews they write themselves, and to those made by the other reviewers.

#### *Definition of Confidentiality*

The term 'confidential' as used above, implies (1) that the reviewer shall keep confidential material in a safe place where it can't be accessed by others, (2) that he shall not divulge the confidential material to any other person except if approved by an Associate Editor or Editor-in-Chief of the Journal, and (3) that any other person that obtains access to the material, after approval, shall also be informed about and accept the same rule.

For more information please have a look at the journals [www.sc-jme.com](http://www.sc-jme.com).