

PEER REVIEW PROCEDURE - MOESZIA

Moeszia-Erdélyi Gombász is a dual-function journal with two editors-in-chief. The first half contains scientific publications, the second is a forum for association news, information and knowledge-dissemination articles. The peer review procedure applies in the case of the scientific publications.

Moeszia. Erdélyi Gombász adopts a strict policy of scientific quality control through the double anonymous peer review system. The editors-in-chief are responsible for the peer review process. The double anonymous peer review system will be applied consistently. The submitted manuscripts will be reviewed by two specialized reviewers external to the institution to which the author of the manuscript is affiliated.

In order to avoid cases of plagiarism, auto plagiarism and other forms of academic fraud, the received manuscripts are subjected to analysis with an identification software. The editorial board reserves the right to directly reject (desk rejection) manuscripts for which the report indicates plagiarism, auto plagiarism or high proportions of similarity to incorrectly cited sources.

The peer review process is coordinated by one of the editors-in-chief.

PEER REVIEW FORM FOR SCIENTIFIC MANUSCRIPTS

1/

Article title:

Volume number:

Coordinator /editor-in-chief/:

2/

Reviewer name and surname (anonymised when submission to author):

Affiliation / research degree:

Date of submission of the paper:

3/ Recommendation:

- (a) Acceptance without modification
- (b) Acceptance with minor modifications
- (c) Acceptance with major modifications (after redo, refer to references)
- (d) Review and resubmission (after redo, refer to references)
- (e) Reject

4/ Detailed report (yes / no).

- (a) Are the facts presented by the author correct?
- (b) Does the article reflect all aspects and research on the subject matter?
- (c) Does the article reflect relevant, current and unanimously accepted research on the subject?
- (d) Are references, including online sources, credible academic resources?

- (e) Is the article logically organized (in terms of the structure of sections and subsections)? Is the wording of the article clear? If not, how can these issues be improved?
- (f) Is there any other reason that we should consider that could affect the reception of this article in the scientific community?

5/ Comments and suggestions (open-ended section, at the choice of the contact person; comments can also be submitted through anonymised text comments)

Summary table of peer review reports

Author/s/	Manuscript title	Decision reviewer 1	Decision reviewer 2	Decision editor/s/-in-chief