

Instructions for reviewers

Before the reviewer begins with a peer-review procedure, it is necessary to determine whether there is a conflict of interests with the author of the article; it is also necessary to determine whether the article belongs to the area of his scientific specialization. The reviewer is not allowed to be a mentor to the author of the article, or a participant in the same scientific project, and the like. In case the reviewer denies the existence of any conflict of interests or that he/she is the author's mentor, etc., the editorial board will reject the received review as invalid and will look for a new reviewer.

The Divine Service publishes the previously unpublished manuscripts and if the reviewer reveals in its proceedings that the manuscript has already been published or released to a large extent, it is necessary to immediately notify the editorial board of the journal.

The reviewer should describe the work briefly, clearly and transparently and refer to the logical structure, content and linguistic finalization of the article.

The reviewer should answer the following questions:

1. Is the content of the article appropriate for the profile of the scientific journal?
2. Does the title reflect the content of the article?
3. Does the paper require additions or shortenings?
4. Is the text understandable to readers?
5. Are quotes and references accurate?
6. Is the summary appropriate to the content?

If the reviewer agrees that the work can be published, he/she should state the mandatory mark (tick number) of categorization of the article:

1. *Original scientific paper* (contains the so far unpublished results of original researches, presented so that the results, analyses and extracts can be checked)
2. *Preliminary communication* (presents in brief the new results of scientific research which demand urgent publishing, assuming that the complete work will be published later on)
3. *Review article* (original and concise display of an area of research with one's own critical review and judgment)
4. *Professional paper* (informs and gives insight into the problems of the profession without pretensions to be the result of scientific research, but its purpose is the dissemination of knowledge)

Additional notes:

Preferred deadline for the review is a month. The length of text reviews should be maximum 2 standard pages of text, unless the reviewer exceptionally estimates that a longer review is necessary. Reviewers can also attach an annotated version of the original text, which will be, in consultation with the reviewer, sent to the author of the article together with the review text.

The review process is bilaterally anonymous (double-blind review): the identity of the author remains unknown until the publication of the text (if the work, for any reason, is not published, the editorial board guarantees the anonymity of the author and will keep the information about the author in the archives of the journal). As a rule, the identity of the reviewers of a particular text is not detected.

In the end, the editorial, on the proposal of two (or more) reviewers, brings the final decision and evaluation of the category of a scientific work.