

CODE OF CONDUCT AND INSTRUCTIONS FOR REVIEWERS

Note: This document is based on the COPE guidelines from 1999, COPE Code of Conduct from 2003, the COPE Best Practice Guidelines from 2007, COPE Code of Conduct and Best Practice Guidelines for Journal Editors from 2011, COPE Principles of Transparency and Best Practice in Scholarly Publishing from 2014, Recommendations on Publication Ethics Policies of the World Association of Medical Editors (WAME), Financial Theory and Practice, Ethical guidelines for journal publishing, Libri & Liberi, Ethical protocol and guidelines for editorial work in journal publishing

Code of conduct for reviewers is designed to provide a set of minimum standards which should be followed by the editors of scientific publications and journals.

1. Contribution to editorial decisions

Reviewer assists an editor in making editorial decisions and through communication of the editor with authors, a reviewer can also help authors improve the quality of work. Peer review is an essential part of formal scientific communication and has a central role in the scientific method.

The task of the reviewer is critical, but also constructive assessment of the received manuscripts. He or she provides detailed and reasoned objections and suggestions related to the research and the way in which it is presented in the work.

2. Timeliness

The selected reviewer who does not consider himself or herself qualified to review the research described in the manuscript or who knows that he or she will not be able to make a timely review; he or she should inform the editor and be excluded from the review process.

3. Confidentiality

Each submission received for review must be treated as a confidential document. It should not be shown or discussed it with other people except with the permission of the editor.

4. Standards of objectivity

Reviews should be conducted objectively. Criticism aimed at the author as person is not appropriate. Reviewers should clearly express their views and support them by arguments. Reviewers' feedback should contribute to the development of both the thinking and writing skills of an author.

5. Referencing

The reviewer should identify relevant articles which were not cited by the author. Any statement that an observation, derivation, or argument had been previously published should be accompanied by a citation. Reviewers also need to alert editors to substantial similarity or overlap between the manuscript under consideration and any published paper they are personally acquainted with.

6. Disclosure of data and conflict of interest

Reviewer must not use unpublished materials disclosed in submitted manuscript for their own research without the express written consent of the author. Confidential information or ideas obtained through the review process must remain confidential and should not be used for personal gain. Reviewers should not agree to review the manuscripts in which there is a conflict of interest because of competition, cooperation, or other relationships or connections with any author, company or institution associated with the work.

If the reviewer accepted for review a paper that he had previously reviewed and rejected for another journal, it is advisable to inform the Editor-in-Chief about this.

REVIEW FORM

(this is only a sample review form, reviewers fill out the review on the Morepress platform)
Zadar, 202..

Dear _____

We kindly ask you to review the manuscript titled _____

in the attachment and send us your review until _____.

If you cannot review it for any reason, please send it back to us and suggest another reviewer, if possible.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Editor-in-chief
Professor Nina Lončar, PhD

REVIEWER'S OPINION*

1. Short evaluation:

- A) accept without changes
- B) accept after the suggested changes had been made
- C) make significant or complete changes before accepting
- D) decline

2. Paper categorization:

- A) original scientific paper
- B) preliminary communication
- C) review

* Encircle the answers to questions 1 and 2 in the original and on the copy.

A) Original scientific paper - original scientific work which contains new results of fundamental or applied research;

B) Preliminary communication - scientific article that includes at least one or more pieces of scientific information, but without enough details for the reader to check the scientific findings;

C) Review - generally summarizes the existing literature on a topic in an attempt to explain the current state of understanding on the topic;

* Encircle the answers to questions 1 and 2 in the original and on the copy

While reviewing, consider the following:

1. Title. Is it suitable? (Suggest another "work title")
 2. Clarity. Is the text clear and logical (without ambiguities).
 3. Structure. Does the work contain the usual parts (abstract with key words, introduction, methodology, results, discussion and conclusion)? Do they make a logical whole?
 4. Repetition. Are there any unnecessary repetitions (if there are, which are they and where they are)?
 5. Mistakes. Are there any mistakes in data processing, graphics, etc.? Do the graphics contain all the necessary data both in Croatian and English?
 6. Uniformity. Are individual parts of the article uniform in terms of their scope?
 7. Terminology. Is it common?
 8. Are the appropriate methods used? Do they need additional clarification?
 9. Conclusion. Is it logical? Is it in accordance with the obtained results?
 10. References. Is citing of literature and sources correct (following technical guidance for the authors)? Are all the references cited in the text included in the reference list and conversely, are all references listed in the reference list cited in the text?
-

Date:.....

Address:.....

.....

Telephone:.....

ID number of the scientist:.....

Reviewer's signature:

.....

Note: Please submit the review in this form (preferably with short explanations in the attachment).