

Problems of Education in the 21st Century

ISSN 1822-7864

ISSN 1822-7864 (Print), ISSN 2538-7111 (Online)

PEER-REVIEW PROCEDURE AND MAIN CRITERIA

Each manuscript of the article submitted to the editorial board of the journal "Problems of Education in the 21st Century" is reviewed by two independent reviewers.

1. The reviewers are appointed confidentially, a double blind review is used. If the problematic of the submitted publication is interdisciplinary, one review is of a scientist from a related scientific field or trend.
2. The reviewers are active scientists of that sphere, i.e. choosing a reviewer, his/her interest sphere and competence are taken into account.
3. The reviewers are appointed from a country other than that of the author.
4. In that case, if the conclusion of one reviewer is positive, and of another – negative, the third reviewer is appointed.
5. If the reviews of two reviewers are negative, the manuscript is rejected and not valued anymore.
6. The referee must decide whether he/she recommends acceptance of the paper or not. Reviews should be conducted objectively.
7. Personal criticism of the author is inappropriate. The reviewers are encouraged to avoid cynical, destructive and unhelpful comments to the author(s).
8. The reviewers undertake to carefully and professionally evaluate the submitted article. It is necessary to fill in the form of the review, which is announced in the journal website (<http://www.scientiasocialis.lt/pec/node/940>). The reviewer evaluates the submitted manuscript and gives one of the following recommendations:
 - Accept without revision,
 - Accept with minor revisions,
 - Accept with moderate revisions,
 - Pre-accept: major revisions and re-evaluation,
 - Reject: rework and re-submit,
 - Reject: do NOT re-submit.
9. The main evaluation criteria are:
 - Technical adequacy,
 - Agreement with theory,
 - Contribution to the field,
 - Significance,

- Originality/innovation,
- Readability,
- Practical/didactical value.

Additional evaluation criteria are reflected in the review form.

10. The reviewers provide written feedback to the authors' manuscript, where there are comments regarding the scientific value of the manuscript. The reviewers also indicate whether the writing is clear, concise, and relevant and rating the work's composition, scientific accuracy, originality, and interest to the journal's readers.
11. Preparation of the review is necessary in all cases. At the same time the reviewers are encouraged to give thorough comments and remarks and/or propose questions directly in the manuscript under review, if the reviewer thinks, that it is necessary.
12. The reviewers submit the reviews of the article in 4 weeks.
13. The reviewers must declare possible conflicts of interest, informing about this Editorial Board by e-mail or by other communication device (Skype: scientia12). The reviewers should declare any potential conflicts of interest and excuse themselves from involvement with any manuscript they feel they would not be able to review objectively or fairly.
14. The reviewers are encouraged to carefully evaluate not only the scientific level of the submitted manuscript, compliance with the journal problematic, but pay special attention to the cited (used) in the article scientific information sources.
15. The reviewers also have to inform the editorial board about the cases of publication similarity to other known for the respondents publications, including wide extent text insertions, the authors of which are not indicated.
16. The reviewer, having received under review article, evaluates his own competence and if it is not sufficient, informs the journal editor about this.
17. The manuscripts, submitted to the reviewers, are impersonal.
18. The names of the reviewers are not declared to the authors.
19. The request to correct/improve article does not guarantee that the revised article will be accepted for publishing.
20. The author (s) shall submit, together with the amended article, an explanatory (rebuttal) letter regarding the corrections and / or improvements that have been made.
21. The final decision on publishing an article or appointing an additional reviewer is made by the chief editor(s).
22. Every submitted paper is checked by an iThenticate: Plagiarism Detection Software (<http://www.ithenticate.com/>).

Renewed and updated document was confirmed on January 15, 2019