

Macedonian Veterinary Review



p-ISSN 1409-7621
e-ISSN 1857-7415

International Scientific Journal of the Faculty of Veterinary Medicine -Skopje

INSTRUCTION FOR REVIEWERS

Conscientious peer review of manuscripts is usually a time consuming task but is essential to assure high quality content for the Journal. When reviewing a manuscript, keep in mind that the purposes of the Journal are to document and improve the quality of veterinary science. To be published, a manuscript must provide useful data or information for the national / international audience of the Journal. If a manuscript has only local relevance, its usefulness to the general audiences of the Journal is limited.

Reviewers are obliged to provide an expert, critical, and constructive scientific and literary appraisal of research reports in a fair and unbiased manner. It is also the obligation of each reviewer to complete their review as soon as possible and return it to the Editor within four weeks. Should a delay in their review occur, the reviewer has the obligation to notify the editor at once.

Comments should be as complete and detailed as possible and contain clear opinions about strengths, weaknesses, relevance, and importance to the field. Specific comments that cite manuscript sections, pages, paragraphs, or lines are most helpful. Comments should be constructive and suggestions should be offered to enhance the manuscript.

Each review of manuscript should have confidential comments to the Editor, general and specific comments to the author, as required. It is good to point out both positive and negative aspects of the manuscript. Keep in mind that the author will receive general and specific comments. The authors will be asked to address each of your comments before the manuscript is formally accepted for publication.

Points important for the reviewer to consider:

- Is the topic of the manuscript appropriate for the Journal?
- Is the information original?
- Is the information of significant interest to the readers?
- Is the title accurate and sufficiently descriptive of the content?
- Is the purpose or objective clearly stated?
- Are the structure, language and abstract acceptable?
- Are the methods appropriate and scientifically sound?
- If a manuscript is based on data, do the data represent an adequate population and is a valid statistical justification included to support the conclusions?
- Are appropriate statistical tests used?
- Are the conclusions supported by the data presented?

- Are the tables and figures well designed and add to understanding of the text?
- Is information in the tables and figures redundant?
- Are the references cited the most appropriate to support the manuscript?
- Should the manuscript be shortened?

After careful consideration, the reviewer should provide one of the following recommendations to the Editor regarding publication:

- **Highly recommended (accepted)** – for high quality manuscripts of high interest to most readers
- **Recommended** – for manuscripts of acceptable quality that are of interest to most readers.

For either of the above, indicate if the recommendation is unconditional or conditional upon modifications by the author. Conditional should be stated as “accept after authors have considered suggestions” or ‘revision needed before decision can be made’.

- **Not recommended (rejected)** – for manuscripts of low quality or of low interest to readers

Reviewers should not:

- Reveal, cite, or in any way disclose information about a manuscript prior to publication.
- Agree to review a manuscript if there is an actual or perceived conflict of interest. Potential conflicts can be discussed with the Editor.

It is permissible to request the assistance of colleagues to review a manuscript. The names of the additional reviewers should be provided to the Editor.