

*Dear readers, dear authors,*

*Recently I received from older colleagues a friendly criticism of the way in which I tend to open my editorials. Namely, they begin with the words, "Dear readers, dear authors". The criticism was that reviewers are not mentioned ("...and dear reviewers").*

*Reviewers are of great importance to a journal that wants to publish relevant scientific papers. In fact, it is the reviewers who give their opinions and recommendations on whether contributions are relevant or not. The more relevant the reviewers are, the more relevant the papers published in the journal will be. Some sources state that peer review is an essential part of research. The reviewers comment on the more important parts of the article and its structure. This draws the authors' attention to facts and elements that are often obvious, and corrections to these can lead to a substantial improvement in the quality of the paper.*

*Throughout my academic career, I have always been grateful to reviewers, even when they have given negative reviews. But what are the qualities that make a good reviewer, and how can authors have respect even when they receive a negative recommendation from them? Quite simply – a good reviewer will always give constructive feedback, regardless of the quality of the work. It is clear that constructive feedback can only be provided by a person who is an expert in the field, but this is something that is taken into account when choosing a reviewer. The main mission of the reviewer, should they choose to accept it, is to help a fellow researcher and assess whether the work is suitable for publication in a journal. For this reason, the process is also known as peer review.*

*There are several ways to structure reviews. Journals (like ours) use a form that takes the reviewer through a kind of checklist that follows a structure important to editors and is linked to instructions for authors. Finally, there is always a section where comments can be written (for both authors and editors). This section usually consists of five basic elements. In the first section (Summary of the Paper), the reviewer provides a brief overview of the paper to ensure that authors recognize that the reviewer has actually read and understood the text, and so that the editor can assess whether the paper is relevant to the journal. The second section (General Comments on the Quality of the Paper) provides basic comments on the quality of the paper. This is often an opportunity for positive and encouraging comments before criticisms are made. Therefore, the good points of the paper itself should be mentioned here. The third section is Essential Revisions, if they are needed (and they often are). The focus should be on the observed omissions, providing brief explanations as to why they are treated as such. Numbering is very often used for ease of reference by the author. The fourth unit (Minor Revisions Needed) addresses typos, numbering errors (or lack of numbering) of chapters, symbols, and more. The final commentary is the fifth section, which serves to place the comments in the context of the paper, the journal, and the research field. The closing commentary should be encouraging and uplifting, although it may be a recommendation to reject the paper. If the paper is rejected, major and minor revisions are not required.*

*If the reviewer empathizes with the author and structures the review so that it begins and ends in a positive and encouraging style, he/she is doing a good job. And the job is to help, not hinder.*

*The job of scientists is to do research and publish its results. Good scientists are endowed with the quality to do this because they love it. Such scientists will also review other people's work, not because they have to, but because they see it as their duty and an integral part of their calling.*

*Therefore, dear reviewers, thank you!*

*Prof. Doris Novak, Ph.D.  
Editor-in-Chief*