

Sustainable Multilingualism **Guidelines for Reviewers**

Submissions assessed as potentially suitable are sent to anonymous peer reviewers for an in-depth review, typically to 2-3 experts. We try to select reviewers from the experts in the appropriate field. However, if you decide that for some reasons you are unable to undertake the review, please notify the submission's editor.

The peer review process aims to ensure a high quality of publications; therefore, you are requested to judge the submitted manuscript for the following aspects:

- novelty and originality, timeliness of the topic,
- significance to the field,
- research design and clarity,
- methodological soundness,
- substantial evidence supporting claims and conclusions,
- technical quality.

We expect you to make an objective, impartial evaluation of scientific merits of the manuscript, giving preference to manuscripts that are well written, well organized, and intelligible to the multidisciplinary and multicultural *Sustainable Multilingualism* audience.

You will be asked to fill in the Manuscript Review Form to be found in Review Form Response by choosing from the options "Yes", "Should be corrected" and "No" in answering the questions of the review form, and choose the General conclusion.

The outcomes of the review process include the following options:

- *Accept without any changes,*
- *Tentatively accept (pending minor revisions reviewed by the author),*
- *Revise and resubmit (for full review by the initial reviewer), or*
- *Reject.*

If a manuscript is believed not to fully meet the standards of the journal or contains major deficiencies, you are requested to provide constructive criticism to assist the authors in improving their work. Extensive review comments are provided only when necessary to authors whose manuscripts are conditionally accepted for publication. Submissions with a recommendation to revise and resubmit may be resubmitted only one time. Articles that are rejected include those that are poorly written or organized, too elementary, or that cover material outside the areas dealt with in *Sustainable Multilingualism*.

You are requested to provide confidential comments to the editor, in case you might have them.

Please mind the review schedule and follow the Review Steps:

1. Notify the submission's editor as to whether you will undertake the review by clicking on **Accepted**. If for some reasons you are unable to undertake the review, please choose the **Response** button.
2. Click on file names to download and review (on screen or by printing) the files associated with this submission.
3. Click on icon to **fill** in the review form.
5. In addition, you can upload files for the editor and/or author to consult.
6. **Select a recommendation** and **submit** the review to complete the process. You must enter a review or upload a file before selecting a recommendation. You are asked to choose one recommendation to the editors from the list of options.

The reviewers state their general conclusion; the final decision to accept or reject the manuscript for publication rests with the journal editors.

Reviewer Responsibilities

(as defined in **Publication Ethics and Publication Malpractice Statement of Sustainable Multilingualism**)

Contribution to editorial decisions

Peer review assists the editor in making editorial decisions and, through the editorial communication with the author, may also assist the author in improving the manuscript.

Promptness

Any invited referee who feels unqualified to review the research reported in a manuscript or knows that its timely review will be impossible should immediately notify the editor so that alternative reviewers can be contacted.

Confidentiality

Any manuscripts received for review must be treated as confidential documents. They must not be shown to or discussed with others except if authorized by the editor.

Standards of objectivity

Reviews should be conducted objectively. Personal criticism of the author is unacceptable. Referees should express their views clearly with appropriate supporting arguments.

Acknowledgement of sources

Reviewers should identify relevant published work that has not been cited by the authors. Any statement that an observation, derivation, or argument had been previously reported should be accompanied by the relevant citation. A reviewer should also call to the editor's attention any substantial similarity or overlap between the manuscript under consideration and any other published data of which they have personal knowledge.

Disclosure and conflict of interest

Privileged information or ideas obtained through peer review must be kept confidential and not used for personal advantage. Reviewers should not consider evaluating manuscripts in which they have conflicts of interest resulting from competitive, collaborative, or other relationships or connections with any of the authors, companies, or institutions connected to the submission.