Peer Review Process

All papers submitted to AMIT are subject to peer review.

1. Forms of reviewing:
   internal – reviewing by the editor-in-chief and members of the editorial board;
   external – reviewing by independent experts.

2. The editor-in-chief determines if the manuscript complies with the subject-matter of the journal and the layout requirements, and, in case of a positive decision, sends the article to further reviewers whose field of expertise is appropriate. In case the article does not correspond to the profile of AMIT or formal publication requirements, it can be rejected without further consideration.

3. The duration of the peer review process should be suitable to the manuscript size and general circumstances. Generally this is around 3 months from the receipt date of the manuscript. The author(s) then receive a decision: either for acceptance, minor or major revision or refusal. In the case of revision a reasonable time period is agreed upon to resubmit the manuscript under consideration of the expressed critique.

4. Reviewers received the manuscripts in an anonymous form, i.e. without knowing the author(s). They are informed that the studies are intellectual property of author(s) and that they may not use or pass on any data from the manuscripts.

5. Reviewing procedure is anonymous both for the expert and author. The texts of negative reviews are sent to the authors without indicating reviewers' names and/or affiliations. The reviewer can only be disclosed if the reviewer agrees to this or expressly requests this.

6. Reviewers complete a reviewer's form, containing questions concerning the general content of the paper, scientific quality of methods and analyses, balance of text against illustrations, validity and originality of conclusions. The review form also includes a general assessment of the article and recommendations for its improvement. Depending on the results of reviewing the article can be rejected, sent back to the author for reworking or accepted for publication.

7. If reviewers remark minor or major necessary revisions to the article, this is returned to the author for revision, together with the anonymous comments. In this case the date of receipt is the date of submission of the revised article. The article revised by the author(s) may be reviewed again, either by the same, or by other reviewer(s).
8. The author(s) is informed in the case of rejection, including an explanation of the refusal reasons. The author does not have the right the text(s) of negative review(s), but these may anonymously be offered by the editor in some cases.

9. After an article is accepted for publication, the author is informed of this. The author does not have the right to demand a specific upcoming volume in which the contribution should appear – this decision is taken by the editor-in-chief.