INSTRUCTIONS TO REVIEWERS

Before you accept to review an article, please make sure the article is within your field of expertise and enquire after possible conflicts of interest. Reviewers are generally not allowed to participate in the same project as mentors or to be otherwise engaged in the preparation of the article which is to be reviewed. By accepting to review an article the reviewer confirms the absence of any conflict of interest between the function of a reviewer and any other professional or personal engagements.

REVIEW STRUCTURE

1. Overview of the article

Brief description of the scope and structure of the paper is required, including the critical appraisal of its logical structure, its style and contextual consistence.

2. Appraisal

The reviewer is required to assess the methodological and theoretical-conceptual foundations of the paper, reflecting on the details and credibility of the arguments presented and calling attention to the strong or problematical points. The review contains personal observations on possible mistakes, taking into consideration the following questions:

- Does the content of the paper agree with the title?
- Does the article need any supplements or reductions?
- Does the author use language comprehensive to potential readers?
- Is the summary in accordance with the contents?

3. Categorisation

Categorisation of the paper requires a thorough consideration of the following:

- Topic: Has the author presented the topic as it should be – focused on (limited to) specific aspects which allow further insight into possible new perceptions?
- References: Has the author taken into consideration relevant written sources related to the theme, not neglecting the sources in Croatian?
- Personal considerations: Has the author presented personal views, opinions, criticisms, insights and conclusions along with the attitudes of other authors?
- High appreciation is to be given to a paper which, under given circumstances in Croatia, presents the assumed topic in an innovative way, or brings together relevant written sources and presents a subject familiar to areas using more popular languages, yet not sufficiently explored in Croatia.
According to the above mentioned elements, the article is classified into one of the following categories:

1) **Original scientific paper**: a paper that according to the reviewers and editorial staff contains unpublished results of original theoretical or practical research, presented in such a way that the accuracy of the offered analyses and conclusions which serve as the grounds for the results can be authenticated.

2) **Preliminary communication**: encloses one or more new scientific data but not sufficient details that would enable authentication as in the case of original scientific papers.

3) **Review**: original, concise and critical presentation of the situation and tendencies of development in some area of research, with a critical consideration and judgement.

4) **Professional paper**: informs and introduces an issue related to a certain area, or presents original solutions concerning that very area.

**4. Recommendation for publishing**

In conclusion, the reviewer recommends that the paper should be published, redone or rejected according to the following:

- **a)** *The text may be published without alterations.*
- **b)** *The text may be published with the alterations proposed in the review.*
- **c)** *The text is to be reviewed after the alterations proposed in the review have been made.*
- **d)** *The text is recommended to be published in some other journal.*
- **e)** *The text is not suitable for publishing.*

**GENERAL NOTES:**

Some general notes:

- The reviewing procedure is anonymous, i.e. the identity of the author remains unknown until the text is actually published while the identity of the reviewer of a text may be released only at the reviewer’s personal request.

- The suggested period for a review is two weeks.

- The reviewer decides on the length of the review and the scope of comments and criticisms.