

GUIDELINES FOR REVIEWERS

Confidentiality

Reviewers are asked to treat all the data as being strictly confidential. We usually contact referees via email and request the review of the particular manuscript. We expect referees to treat even this initial request as confidential.

Criteria for publishing in Folia Biologica

The manuscript must be within the Aims and Scope of Folia Biologica.

The reported approach and data should be
novel
have specific biological significance
methods used must be sufficient to support conclusions derived and must be up to-date and deal with the topics on cellular and/or molecular levels
papers that have broad biological significance are given a priority

Reviewers are requested:

Prior to initiating the review process, to fill the review form and confirm that no objections against serving as a referee in the particular review process may exist.

Not to discuss with anyone not directly involved in the review process. If colleagues are consulted, their identity should be acknowledged to Folia Biologica.

In case that reviewer feels that specialists for particular method or field should be contacted and asked for his/her opinion, the approval has to be requested from the Folia Biologica in order to prevent involvement of people against the opinion of the Editors.

If for any reason, reviewers feel that it is appropriate to reveal their identity to authors, it has to be done strictly via the editor. Authors are requested neither to attempt to determine the identities of referees nor to confront them. The reviewers are requested to neither confirm nor deny any speculation in this regard if approached by authors.

Selecting reviewers

Highly qualified specialists are selected from the international scientific community to provide their expertise and opinion. The selection of reviewers is based on their field of expertise, reputation, recommendations from scientists known to members of the Editorial Board and suggestions from authors and our previous experience. Folia Biologica ensures the review process to be highly qualified, fast, justified and fair.

Actions to be taken if the manuscript is accepted for a review

Download the manuscript

Decide if you can judge the article impartially.

Decide if you can review the paper in reasonable time frame. As a rule, the review should be returned within 14 days. If you find that a detailed review may require more time than you can dedicate, please, inform the staff of Folia Biologica. This allows the Editors to find alternative reviewers.

Control the overall quality of strategy, methods, figures, introduction, discussion.

Our Editorial processes often indicate specific questions and concerns. **Please, answer our specific questions.**

We appreciate reviews that provide us with clear substantiated arguments.

The report should be organized in the following way:

1/ Summarize the major questions that are relevant to the reported work, major findings and the overall importance of the reported work. Describe also major problems or shortcomings of the manuscript.

2/ List major concerns and criticisms. Number each of specific comments so that each of them may be answered by authors separately.

3/ List minor points.

The reviewers are asked to answer following questions:

What is the major aim of the paper?

What are the major claims of the paper?

Are the claims of the paper supported by reported data?

Are the claims of the paper novel?

Are claims appropriately discussed and the previous findings appropriately acknowledged?

Is the Introduction written in a clear way and the reasoning for the strategy of the paper substantiated and is appropriate credit given to previous papers that lead to the reported work?

Can the paper be regarded as a high quality paper in the particular field?

Are conclusions of the paper sufficiently supported by the reported experiment or are there other obvious experiments that need to be done in order to strengthen the quality of the paper?

Should the paper be improved in its' structure and writing?

Do you suggest to substantially shorten the paper.

Do you suggest to request publishing additional information on the Internet?

Folia Biologica asks specifically reviewers to check if appropriate credit is given to the papers published previously and the papers cited in the manuscript deserve to be acknowledged in the particular context.

Please, make your review helpful to authors. Be critical but positive and impartial. Wherever possible, explain to the authors the weaknesses of their manuscript. Clear indication of weaknesses usually helps to substantially improve the manuscript.

Using the following form as a guide for preparation of the review report is optional.

Please prepare the review report as a Word document or using an equivalent program and submit it using **Online Manuscript Submission and Tracking System.**

REVIEW FORM (for FOLIA BIOLOGICA (PRAHA) Journal of Cellular and Molecular Biology

Ref. :

Manuscript number:

Title:

General description and detailed opinion:

1/ Summarize the major questions that are relevant to the reported work, major findings and the overall importance of the reported work. Describe also major problems or shortcomings of the manuscript.

2/ List major concerns and criticisms. Number each of specific comments so that each of them may be answered by authors separately.

3/ List minor points.

Please answer following questions:

What is the major aim of the paper?

What are the major claims of the paper?

Are the claims of the paper supported by reported data?

Are the claims of the paper novel?

Are claims appropriately discussed and the previous findings appropriately acknowledged?

Is the Introduction written in a clear way and the reasoning for the strategy of the paper substantiated and is appropriate credit given to previous papers that lead to the reported work?

Can the paper be regarded as a high quality paper in the particular field?

Are conclusions of the paper sufficiently supported by the reported experiment or are there other obvious experiments that need to be done in order to strengthen the quality of the paper?

Should the paper be improved in its' structure and writing?

Do you suggest to substantially shortening the paper.

Do you suggest requesting publishing additional information on the Internet?

Additional questions:

1. Does the article fit within the scope of Folia Biologica? Yes No

2. Do all the results of the experimental work justify the conclusion? Yes No

3. Does the article contain sufficient new data to justify publication? Yes No

4. If the article is suitable for publication in Folia Biologica, is the length and content of the Introduction sufficient?*

No Too long Reasonable

**If No, please propose alterations in the Referee Evaluation Sheet.*

Are the described experimental methods sufficient for reproducing the experiments?

Yes No

If No, please identify the relevant methods in the Referee Evaluation Sheet.

Are the results presented with sufficient clarity?

Yes No

If No, please comment in the Referee Evaluation Sheet.

Are all tables and figures necessary?

Yes No

If No, please identify the relevant ones in the Referee Evaluation Sheet.

Are the conclusions justified?

Yes No

If No, please comment in the Referee Evaluation Sheet.

Is the length and content of Discussion sufficient?

No Too long Reasonable

If No, please comment in the Referee Evaluation Sheet.

5. Final evaluation:

Accept

Accept after minor revision

Accept after major revision

Reject

**Please indicate the recommendation also in the Review submission window.
(Accept after minor revision and Accept after major revision are both indicated as REVISION REQUIRED).**

** Instruction to reviewer: indicate, please, your opinion by marking the respective answer*