

INSTRUCTIONS FOR REVIEWERS

The Editorial Board of the *Matica Srpska Journal for Philology and Linguistics* strives to secure a high quality of papers published in the journal. The reviewers' participation in this process is of great importance and we highly appreciate their work.

1. DEADLINE FOR THE REVIEW

The deadline for the review is 30 days after receiving the paper. The review should be sent in the form that the reviewer has received from the editor.

2. CODE OF ETHICS

Reviewing is double-blind. Reviewers should notify the editor if there is a conflict of interest when they receive the paper for review.

Reviewers should notify the editor if they notice that the paper violates any kind of ethical or scientific code.

Reviewers should treat each manuscript as a confidential document and should not share information about it unless the editor approves it for the purpose of arriving at an objective assessment of the paper. The data from the manuscript cannot be used until the paper is published. The authors who submit their papers for consideration in the *Matica Srpska Journal for Philology and Linguistics* are expected to act as reviewers on other occasions if the Editorial Board makes such a request.

3. REVIEWING THE PAPER

When reviewing the paper, the reviewer assesses if it is an original study, if its topic and content fits the scope of the journal, if it is based on relevant scientific discoveries from the given field, and if it comprises all the necessary elements proscribed by the Instruction for authors: title, abstract, key words, main text, summary, references.

The reviewer proposes the category for the paper: 1) original scientific paper; 2) review paper.

An original scientific paper must include: the scientific context of the problem with reference to relevant results of previous research and adequate sources, corpus, methods and aims of the research, and, after the analysis of the research problem, it should clearly state the results in the conclusion. The review should highlight if any of these elements are missing.

A review paper provides a comprehensive and critical presentation of a certain problem and relevant literature and a new synthesis of scientific information. It indicates similarities, differences and shortcomings in the existing literature and should contain the author's theoretically founded point of view.

The reviewer proposes to the Editorial Board: 1) to accept the paper without changes, 2) to accept the paper under the condition that parts of the paper are reduced, rewritten or omitted, 3) to reject the paper. If the reviewer suggests changes in the paper, they should list: a) changes that must be made for the paper to be published, b) changes that are recommended but are not necessary. In case the reviewer rejects the paper, they should provide a short explanation.

Reviewers are not expected to proofread the paper, but it is advisable to suggest if the paper requires proofreading.