

Folia Oecologica journal – review procedure

The aim of the peer review procedure is to ensure that high quality original papers are published in the Folia Oecologica journal.

1. Papers are submitted to the journal editorial office by e-mail: knizuel@ife.sk. There is no need for lengthy and demanding registration or filling out questions. Related information is available at: <https://ife.sk/research/edited-journals/folia-oecologica/>
2. The authors are requested to submit MS that have not been, nor will be, published elsewhere. This fact should be explicitly stated in a cover letter.
3. All new submissions are subsequently evaluated (by the editor-in-chief) for their compatibility with the journal scope and aims. In case of negative decision, the submission procedure is ceased and the corresponding author is informed about the manuscript rejection as the subject of the paper is outside the aims and scope of the journal. Author(s) of manuscripts rejected at this stage are informed within 10 days.
4. After the positive evaluation by the editor-in-chief, the manuscript is assigned a senior editor who manages the paper in the next stages of the publishing process. Further manuscript is passed to single-blind review. Reviewers are specialists in the field. Reviewers are matched to the paper (by senior editor) according to their expertise. Authors are requested to suggest five persons competent to review their manuscript. However, the final selection of reviewers is exclusively the Editor's decision.
5. The reviewer, who is working in a different scientific organisation than the author(s), reviews the manuscript. Reviewers can be from any country, it just depends on their expertise.
6. Each manuscript is evaluated by at least two reviewers. After receiving a minimum of two reviews, the senior editor will suggest the editor-in-chief the next steps for the manuscript (Accept, Revisions or Reject).
7. If the article is not excluded, the corresponding author receives the report with reviewers' comments. The author(s) is (are) obliged to respond to the comments and send back the

corrected manuscript to the editorial office as soon as possible. However, within 60 days at the latest.

8. In case of two negative reviews, the review procedure is ceased and the corresponding author is informed about the rejection of the manuscript.

9. In the case of receiving one positive and one negative review, the manuscript is evaluated by additional reviewer whose decision is binding (the reviewer assigning is described in par. 4).

10. In conclusion during the substantive and language reviews, the executive editor screens the manuscript for adherence to the editorial requirements (formulas, units, citations, bibliography, structure of the manuscript, quality of the graphs etc.) and English language.

11. Any remarks and suggestions are forwarded to the corresponding author who is obliged to include them in the final version of the manuscript.

12. After positive processing the manuscript through two reviews and making corrections and additions to the article, the corresponding author is informed about the date of publication of the manuscript.

Reviewers are asked to evaluate a manuscript for:

- novelty or originality of the work.
- broad interest to the community of researchers,
- significance to the field, potential impact of the work, conceptual or methodological, advances described,
- study design and clarity,
- substantial evidence supporting claims and conclusions,
- rigorous methodology.