

## Instructions for Reviewers

*Folia Horticulturae* accepts research articles and reviews that fulfil the requirements of high quality scientific papers and provide novelty to a broad scientific community in the field of horticultural sciences. We do appreciate Reviewers' critical opinions on the submitted manuscripts, which help to improve the quality of the manuscripts accepted for publication as well as to reject manuscripts of low quality and significance. Therefore, comments justifying the Reviewer's opinion and recommendations for the Editor are crucial.

By agreeing to perform a review, the Reviewer declares no conflict of interests with the Authors nor a body founding their research. In case of any doubts, the relevant explanation must be provided and then the Editor will make appropriate decision if the Reviewer is eligible to perform the requested review.

Comments to the Authors must be provided in English and they will be sent to the Authors. The Reviewer's name and the confidential comments to the Editor remain blind and will not be forwarded to the Authors.

The comments are crucial for the Editor to make a proper decision on the manuscript, thus the comments must be justified and convincing. They are also significant for the Authors, enabling them to improve the manuscript to meet the requirements of a high quality scientific article.

The questions provided in the table below are given only to help in the reviewing process, and do not have to be attached to the revision.

Reviewers are asked to express one of the following recommendations for publication in *Folia Horticulturae*: accept, revision, or reject.

All submissions must be made electronically via the Editorial Manager:  
<http://www.editorialmanager.com/fhort/> within 21 days.

**Questions for consideration while providing an opinion on the manuscript:**

1. Does the manuscript follow the aim and scope of Folia Horticulturae?
2. Does the **manuscript** present novelty?
3. Is the **manuscript** of scientific importance?
4. Is the **manuscript** clearly written and well organized?
5. Does the **title** correspond to the presented findings?
6. Is the **abstract** adequate and does it contain all of the most important information on the aim, material, methods, results and conclusions presented in the text?
7. Is the **abstract** clear and concise?
8. Are the **keywords** adequate and complete and do not repeat words from the title?
9. Does the **introduction** clearly describe a scientific background and the current state of knowledge?
10. Is the aim of the **manuscript** clearly stated?
11. Does **material and methods** describe precisely research material and methods used that would allow repetition of the work?
12. Is the **experimental** design appropriate and controls included?
13. Are all **methods** appropriate and complete?
14. Are statistical **methods** appropriate and complete?
15. Are **results** presented correctly and concisely?
16. Are all necessary **results** presented?
17. Is the **nomenclature** correct? Do units follow SI system?
18. Is the description of the **results** congruent with statistical analyses?
19. Are all **tables** and **figures** necessary?
20. Are all **tables** and **figures** readable and informative?
21. Do the **tables** and/or **figures** present data not repeated in the text and *vice versa*?
22. Are the findings **discussed** correctly with the literature cited?
23. Is the **discussion** adequate, not too speculative nor too descriptive?
24. Is the **discussion** supported by the appropriate and recent references to published works?
25. Are **conclusions** justified by the results obtained?
26. Are **conclusions** clear and concise?
27. Is all relevant **literature** cited?
28. Are all **references** of international coverage? (no texts in Polish)
29. Is the list of **references** fully compatible with the **citations** in the text and *vice versa*?