



## *Reviewer's Guide*

The 4D Journal of Landscape Architecture and Garden Art accepts for publication studies on a wide range of topics and methodologies, including manuscripts publishing the results of research on open space design theory, garden history, landscape history, urban heritage, landscape value conservation, urbanism, green infrastructure, climate adaptation; critical design reviews and research based on the analysis and synthesis of existing research. Accordingly, there is no uniform requirement for the structure of studies.

### *Evaluation criteria*

The following general evaluation criteria may help in the assessment of the manuscripts received:

- Is this a new and original contribution or have the research results been published elsewhere?
- Is the article sufficiently comprehensive and critical?
- Does the title clearly and adequately reflect the content?
- Does the abstract briefly and accurately outline the research aim, methodology, and main results and conclusions?
- Is the text accurate, professional and readable?
- Is the structure and relationship between the content of the article appropriate?
- Is the appendix or the attached database adequate?
  - Are illustrations and tables necessary and acceptable?
  - Are the sources and explanations of the figures and images acceptable?
- Is the literature review adequate?
  - Are the references to other relevant publications adequate?
- Do the results contain noteworthy, novel findings?
  - Are there any factual errors or conceptual gaps?
  - Are the methods and their application correct?
  - Is the interpretation of the results arguable?
  - Are there any important aspects that have been ignored?

— Are scientific and technical terms correct and accurate?

4D articles are published after double-blind reviewing; this means the identity of the reviewer is unknown to the author, so please avoid providing identifying information. The articles are published after proofreading in English and Hungarian, so the primary purpose of reviewing is not to indicate linguistic or stylistic problems.

### *Proposal of the reviewer*

Please review the article on the website. You may also record a message to the editors only and upload a Word document with comments in the text.\* Afterwards, please choose one of the following editorial suggestions:

**Accept without revisions:**

*(**Acceptable in its current state**, but needs editing. Please **DO NOT** choose this option if you have made **ANY** significant comments or suggestions.)*

**Accept after minor revisions**

*(Revision is necessary – authors should integrate the comments and suggestions. In this case, it is an editorial decision as to whether to send the article back to the reviewer after correction.)*

**Reconsider after major revisions**

*(**Rejected in its current form**, but after the authors have revised the article, it will be shared with the reviewers again.)*

**Another journal is recommended**

*(If an article is not compatible with the objectives of 4D.)*

**Publishing not recommended**

*(**Rejected**, for the reasons listed by the reviewer.)*

We are grateful for the work of the reviewers, who contribute to ensuring that only high-quality work in the spirit of the journal is published in 4D, and thus help to raise the quality of our journal. We hope that the peer-review process will also result in valuable perspectives for the editors. The names of the reviewers who contributed to each volume will be published in the last issue of that year, and a certificate of their reviewing work will be provided upon request.

---

\* Editors are asked to make critical comments as constructive as possible, without the use of negative or condescending adjectives. Reasons should be clearly stated if the article is rejected.