

Information for Reviewers

Acta Pharmaceutica uses a formal process of appointment to the review panel and requires specific expertise in the field from the reviewers. In order to assign appropriate reviewers, Editors must match reviewers with the scope of the content in a manuscript to get the best reviews possible. Potential reviewers should provide Journal with accurate and fair representation of their expertise as well as verifiable and accurate contact information.

In *Acta Pharmaceutica* identity of the peer reviewer is not disclosed to the authors unless the reviewer says so. This is a single-blind review journal. Reviews should only be undertaken by the appointed reviewer.

The responsibilities and tasks involved in reviewing a paper can only be attributed to and performed by the human submitting the review. Journals should not allow the use of genAI tools in peer review. AI-generated reviews are not accountable or verifiable. Manuscripts under review must never be uploaded to public genAI platforms, as this may infringe intellectual property rights and agreements on confidentiality.

The potential referee should agree in reviewing a submitted paper on the understanding he/she has necessary expertise to assess the manuscript in an unbiased manner. Clear communication between the Journal and the reviewer is essential to facilitate consistent, fair and timely review.

It is courteous to respond to an invitation to peer review within a reasonable time frame, even if the potential reviewer cannot undertake the task. If he/she feels qualified to judge a particular manuscript, he/she should agree to review only if able to do it within the proposed or mutually agreed time frame. Very important, the Journal tries its best to ensure the peer review process remains timely.

The reviewer is expected to declare all potential competing or conflicting interests (personal, financial, intellectual, professional, political, or other) preventing him/her from providing a fair and unbiased review to the Journal. Similarly, the Journal should be notified as soon as possible if the potential reviewer finds not to have the necessary expertise to assess the relevant aspects of a manuscript. If the reviewer comes across any irregularities with respect to research and publication ethics he/she should let the Journal be aware of that asap. If a reviewer suspects undisclosed genAI use in a submission, they should report it to the handling editor for investigation.

Reviewer has an obligation to conduct review in an ethical and accountable manner respecting the confidentiality of the peer review process and refraining from using information obtained during the peer review process for its own or another's advantage, or to disadvantage, or discredit others.

Review should be objective and constructive to help the authors to improve their manuscript, e.g., it is helpful to be specific in the critique and provide supporting evidence, if available.

A recommendation to accept/revise/reject is expected to be congruent with the comments provided in the review. If the work is not clear because of missing analyses, the reviewer should comment and explain what additional analyses would clarify the work submitted. Suggestions must be based on valid academic or technological reasons. Rejections would mainly rely on substantial deficiencies rather than technical/linguistic ones. Most feedback should be put in the report that the authors will see.

Also, the reviewing process should not be intentionally prolonged. Moreover, if anything relevant comes to light after the review has been submitted that might affect the original feedback and recommendations of the reviewer the Journal should be contacted asap.

For those who have not reviewed the whole manuscript but the part of it, to indicate which aspects of the manuscript they have assessed.

The reviewers are also asked, if possible, to try to accommodate requests from the Journal to review revisions or resubmissions of manuscripts they have reviewed previously.

If the Editor handling a manuscript decided to provide a review of the manuscript itself (perhaps if another reviewer could not return a report), this should be done transparently and not under the guise of an anonymous additional reviewer.