

Instruction for reviewers

Medical Research is a scientific journal that publishes previously unpublished scientific papers in the field of biomedical sciences.

The articles are classified into the following categories:

1. Original article/Original research
2. Narrative Review
3. Case report and case series
4. Systematic review and meta-analysis
5. Letter to the Editor and Short Communication
6. Informative article (editorial, commentary)
7. Review (book, scientific event)

Peer reviewers

Journal Medical Research uses a double-blind review system for all papers. At least two reviewers review each manuscript. The reviewers act independently and are unaware of each other's identities. The reviewers' identities are concealed from the authors, and the authors' identities are hidden from the reviewers throughout the review process. The reviewers are selected solely on the basis of whether they possess the relevant expertise to evaluate a manuscript. When selecting reviewers, care is taken to ensure that they are not from the same institution/university as the authors of the manuscript and that they have not been co-authors with them during the past three years. The editorial board is not obliged to accept the reviewers suggested by the authors, and the editorial board makes the final decision on the selection of reviewers.

The purpose of peer review is to assist the Editorial Board in deciding on whether to accept or reject a paper. The purpose is also to help the author in improving papers.

Peer review process

Manuscripts are sent for peer review only after an initial editorial quality check (the so-called editorial screening) by the editorial board, which determines whether, in terms of format and thematic scope, they are suitable for publication in the journal.

Under normal circumstances, the review process takes up to four weeks, and in exceptional cases, it may take up to three months. The total period from manuscript submission to publication averages 90 days.

During the review process, the Editor-in-Chief may require authors to provide additional information (including raw data) if they are necessary for the evaluation of the manuscript. These materials shall be kept confidential and must not be used for any other purposes.

The journal is managed through an electronic platform that facilitates online editing and publishing. The platform also enables the integration of papers into the cross-referencing system (CrossRef/DOI), plagiarism prevention (CrossCheck), indexing in the Serbian Citation Index, DOI assignment, advanced online publication of papers (Online First), bibliometric reports, and more.

Resolving inconsistencies

In the case that the authors have serious and reasonable objections to the reviews, the Editorial Board makes an assessment of whether a review is objective and whether it meets academic standards. If there is a doubt about the objectivity or quality of review, the Editor-in-Chief will assign additional reviewer(s).

Additional reviewers may also be assigned when reviewers' decisions (accept or reject) are contrary to each other or otherwise substantially incompatible.

The final decision on the acceptance of the manuscript for publication rests solely with the Editor-in-Chief.

Reviewers' responsibilities

Reviewers are required to provide the qualified and timely assessment of the scholarly merits of the manuscript. The reviewer takes special care of the real contribution and originality of the manuscript. The review must be fully objective. The judgment of the reviewers must be clear and substantiated by arguments.

The reviewers assess manuscript for the compliance with the profile of the journal, the relevance of the investigated topic and applied methods, the scientific relevance of information presented in the manuscript, the presentation style and scholarly apparatus. The review has a standard

format. It is submitted through the online journal management system where it is stored permanently.

The reviewer must not be in a conflict of interest with the authors or funders of research. If such a conflict exists, the reviewer is obliged to promptly notify the Editor-in-Chief. The reviewer shall not accept for reviewing papers beyond the field of his/her full competence.

Reviewers should alert the Editor-in-Chief to any well-founded suspicions or the knowledge of possible violations of ethical standards by the authors. Reviewers should recognize relevant published works that have not been considered in the manuscript. They may recommend specific references for citation, but shall not require to cite papers published in Medicinska istraživanja, or their own papers, unless it is justified.

The reviewers are expected to improve the quality of the manuscript through their suggestions. If they recommend correction of the manuscript prior to publication, they are obliged to specify the manner in which this can be achieved.

Any manuscripts received for review must be treated as confidential documents. Reviewers must not use unpublished materials disclosed in submitted manuscripts without the express written consent of the authors.

If additional information about the peer-review process is needed, the COPE guidelines for reviewers are recommended (<https://publicationethics.org/guidance/guideline/ethical-guidelines-peer-reviewers>).