

## **ARA Peer Review Process**

*ARA Reports* is an open peer review journal. The review process consists of two stages – internal and external.

### *Internal peer review process*

All submissions are evaluated firstly by the Editorial Board, who makes an initial decision regarding the acceptance or rejection of the article. The editor in chief has the right to reject the contribution without further reviewing if it does not comply with the basic publishing requirements for scientific text, the topic is outside the scope of the journal, the originality of the contribution is questionable, etc. Nevertheless, even prior to submitting the article for external peer reviewing, the editor might require the author to bring adjustments to the content, its form or linguistic aspects, or request any other adjustment based on the author submission guidelines.

Contributions to the sections *Book reviews*, *Notes and discussions* and *Obituaries* are evaluated only by the Editorial Board.

### *External peer review process*

The accepted contributions are further sent to external peer reviewers, experts in the field, selected by the Editorial Board. The referees review the paper and provide any editor comments, suggestions and recommendations. The review process results in one of the following: recommendation to acceptance, recommendations to minor/major revision, or rejection of the manuscript. The author is further informed by the Editorial Committee regarding the results. In the event of a favourable opinion from the referee, the committee refers any eventual comments to the author. If there are revisions to be done, the author decides whether to make these and submits the revised form of the manuscript. The editor ultimately decides whether to accept or

reject the article. Unless it suffers substantial transformation, the manuscript is eligible to be accepted and further analysed by the Editorial Committee, and after all modifications are done, it goes into production and is published.

If the manuscript suffers a major transformation, it is again sent by the editor to the external peer reviewer. The author can express discontent with the review, or parts of it, explaining his position to the editor in chief. The content of the letter is sent to the reviewer and to the Editorial Board. If an accord cannot be reached between the reviewer's comments and recommendations and the author's opinion, the Editorial Board sends the manuscript to a second reviewer.