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Anonymous review procedure. Responsibilities and rights of reviewers. Review Guidelines.

Anonymous review procedure

The purpose of anonymous peer reviewing by experts in a field is to assist the editors in making publication decisions, but it also helps the author(s) to improve their manuscript.

Double anonymous peer review is an important stage in the publication of manuscripts in the journal *Contrastive Linguistics*, as it ensures that the published texts meet the highest quality requirements of scientific publications in the relevant field.

The double-blind review rule also applies in cases of thematic issues or supplements, including in cases where a guest-editor is responsible for an issue.

An editor of the journal *Contrastive Linguistics* performs a technical check immediately after the submission of a manuscript to see if the requirements for anonymity have been met. If they have been violated, the author is informed and required to submit an anonymized version of their text to the management and publishing system.

After the submitted manuscript has been checked for anonymity, an appropriate editor is notified to recommend at least two anonymous reviewers who are experts in the field of the submitted manuscript.

Anonymous reviews are submitted to the manuscript management and publishing system. Before the Editorial Board decides to publish a manuscript, the authors are made aware of the anonymous reviews and are asked to make corrections that are suggested in the anonymous reviews. If the author(s) disagrees with the reviewers' notes and recommendations, they can request a third anonymous review or retract their text.

Based on the two reviews received, the Editorial Board decides on the publication of a manuscript. If both anonymous reviews are negative, the manuscript is not published. If only one of the reviews is negative and recommends rejecting a manuscript, a third anonymous reviewer is appointed. Reviewers remain anonymous both during and after reviewing, i.e. even after the publication of the manuscript. Authors remain anonymous until publication of their text.

**Responsibilities and rights of reviewers**

All selected reviewers are required to strictly comply with the review requirements disclosed in the reviewer card and to ensure the completeness and systematicity of the submitted review.

Any selected reviewer who does not feel qualified to evaluate the research presented in a manuscript or suspects that they will not be able to submit the review on time should notify the editor immediately so that another reviewer can be selected.

When choosing anonymous reviewers, the Editorial Board is guided by the following principles:

- The reviewer is a specialist in the field in which the manuscript is submitted.

- The reviewer has no conflict of interest with the author(s).

- The reviewer has not been a co-author with any of the authors of a submitted manuscript in the preceding three years.

- The reviewer does not work at the same institution as the author(s).

- The reviewer has the educational and scientific degree "doctor".

For reviewing purposes, each manuscript is treated as confidential. Reviewers are not permitted to discuss the manuscripts they are evaluating except as expressly instructed by the editor and with authorized persons.

The review process is free of bias, personal preferences, or prejudices. Personal criticism directed at the author(s) of a manuscript is not accepted.

Anonymous reviewers have the right to recommend the manuscript for publication without changes, with minor revisions, after a complete revision, or to reject it as unfit for publication. Any recommendation, suggestion, or criticism that the reviewer makes must be supported by objective and reasoned arguments.

Reviewers are required to find publications directly relevant to the topic that have not been cited by the author. Claims by the reviewer that an argument or conclusion has been previously published must be supported by appropriate citations. The reviewer should bring to the editor's attention any significant similarities or overlaps between the manuscript under review and any other publication with which they are personally familiar.

Privileged information or ideas obtained as a result of reviewing manuscripts are treated as confidential and cannot be used for personal gains by the reviewers.

Reviewers should refuse to review manuscripts in which there are grounds for a conflict of interest, for example, co-authorship, personal competition, or other type of affiliation with the authors or other natural and legal persons directly related to the manuscript.

Reviewers do not have the right to demand the citation of their own papers unless there is a strictly scientific reason for doing so. Reviewers must refrain from abusive, hostile, or defamatory language.

Reviewers may be included in the List of Reviewers of the journal *Contrastive Linguistics* after approval by the Editorial Board.

Anonymous reviewers receive a certificate for their reviews.

Reviewers receive a printed copy of the issue of *Contrastive Linguistics* in which the manuscript they have reviewed has been published.

**Guidelines for reviewers for preparing their reviews**

Reviewers are invited to anonymously review a manuscript. The reviewers are free to accept or reject the said invitation, indicating their reasons for doing so.

If a reviewer accepts to prepare an anonymous review, they have the obligation within two months to prepare the review and submit it through the manuscript management and publication system. The reviewer may request an extension of the review period, if necessary, for valid reasons.

The submitted anonymous reviews are assessed by the Editorial Board for their quality, for the reviewer's comments, suggestions, and their recommendation for publication or not of the manuscript.

The review assesses the conceptual, linguistic, and structural qualities of the manuscript submitted for anonymous review.

Obligatory dimensions of assessing the manuscript by reviewers

- The contents of the manuscript - does it contain new and significant information that warrants its publication.

- The abstract - whether it clearly and accurately presents the contents of the manuscript.

- Main problem – whether the problem addressed in the manuscript is significant and whether it is presented concisely and clearly.

- The methods – whether the methods are clearly described in the manuscript submitted for review and whether they are adequately chosen to provide answers to the central research question.

- Interpretation and conclusions – whether the interpretation and conclusions are justified by the analysis and results presented by the author(s) of the manuscript.

- References to other studies – are the references topical for the issues presented in the manuscript.

- Language – is the language of the manuscript adequate to the best practices in the relevant scientific field.

Significance of the proposed manuscript for the respective field

- The manuscript proposed for anonymous review is rated on a scale of 1 (highest importance) to 10 (lowest importance).

Structure of the manuscript

- Length of the manuscript – whether the length is adequate, or whether the proposed text is either too long or too short.

- Tables – indicate the number and quality of tables.

- Figures – indicate the number and quality of figures.

Conflict of interests

The reviewer indicates if there is any conflict of interest with respect to reviewing the proposed text.

Overall assessment of the qualities of the peer-reviewed manuscript

The peer-reviewed manuscript is evaluated along 4 criteria using a 5-point scale: excellent, good, average, below average, poor.

- Interest – rating on a 5-point scale the relevance and potential contribution of the manuscript for the field and the community.

- Quality – evaluation on a 5-point scale of the overall quality of the manuscript.

- Originality – evaluation of the originality of the manuscript on a 5-point scale.

- Summative assessment – ​​assessment on a 5-point scale.

Reviewer's final recommendation

The reviewer is obligated to make a final recommendation for the acceptance or rejection of the proposed manuscript:

- Accept as is

- Accept with minor revisions

- Accept after major revisions

- Reject

*Post-review assessment of the manuscript*

The reviewer has the right to request to review the revise version of the manuscript.

Comments

*Confidential comments intended for the editor*

The reviewer can send comments to the editor that the author(s) of the manuscript would not be privy to. Comments should clearly describe the subject of the comment or the problem the reviewer sees. It is good practice for comments to be accompanied by recommendations for resolving the problem.

*Comments intended for the author*

The reviewer submits their comments and notes to the author, presenting clear and instructive arguments. It is good practice for comments intended for the author to be accompanied by recommendations.