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?