



## **Scrinia Slavonica**

Annual of the Department for the History of Slavonia, Srijem and Baranja  
of the Croatian Institute of History

### **Publication Ethics and Malpractice Statement**

**Scrinia Slavonica** is a peer-reviewed academic journal published by the Croatian Institute of History, Department for the History of Slavonia, Srijem and Baranja (Slavonski Brod, Croatia).

The journal's Editorial Board and Advisory Board consist of members who are recognized experts in the field of historical research, with significant contributions to the history of the area covered by the journal.

There are no fees or charges for manuscript processing and/or publishing materials in the journal.

Being funded from public sources and published by a public research institution, the journal maintains public access to its digital contents. All articles published in **Scrinia Slavonica** are available free of charge on its webpage at the Portal of Croatian scientific journals: <https://hrcak.srce.hr/scrinia-slavonica>. The journal permits unrestricted non-commercial use, distribution, and reproduction of its contents in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

**Scrinia Slavonica** provides the electronic backup and preservation of access to the journal content in the event the journal is no longer published by archiving its contents at the Portal of Croatian scientific journals (<https://hrcak.srce.hr/>).

Publisher and editors take reasonable steps to identify and prevent the publication of papers where research misconduct has occurred. In the event that the publisher or editors become aware of any allegation of research misconduct, they shall deal with such allegations appropriately.

**Scrinia Slavonica** is fully committed to the principle and promotion of freedom of research and expression. The journal assumes no responsibility for statements of fact or opinion made by contributors.

Any complaints from readers or authors regarding any material published in the journal should be sent to the Editorial Board or directly to the Editor-in-Chief. Publisher and editors shall always be willing to publish corrections, clarifications, retractions and apologies when needed.

### **Guidelines for Authors**

Authorship should be limited to those who have made a significant contribution to the conception, composition, execution, or interpretation of the reported study. All those who have made significant contributions should be listed as co-authors.

An author should not in general publish manuscripts describing essentially the same research in more than one journal or other publication. Submitting the same manuscript to more than one journal concurrently constitutes unethical publishing behaviour and is unacceptable.

The authors should ensure that they have written entirely original works. If the authors have used the work and/or words of others, all of these instances must be appropriately cited or quoted. Proper acknowledgment of the work of others must always be given. Authors should cite all publications that have been directly influential in determining the nature of their work.

Fraudulent or knowingly inaccurate statements constitute unethical behaviour and are unacceptable.

Authors should declare in their manuscript any significant source of financial support for the research and writing project resulting in the manuscript.

When an author discovers a significant error or inaccuracy in his/her own submitted work, it is his/her obligation to promptly notify the journal editor or publisher and cooperate with the editor to retract or correct the paper. This obligation is pertinent even if the paper is already published, in which case the journal will publish a Corrigendum in its subsequent issue.

All authors of research contributions are obliged to participate in peer review process.

## **Rules of the Peer Review Procedure**

1. All research papers – to be eventually categorized as original scientific papers, preliminary reports, review articles, or professional papers – are subjected to peer review. Other contributions, such as book and conference reviews, obituaries, polemics, notifications etc., are not peer reviewed, their publication being decided on by the the Editorial Board and Editor-in-Chief.
2. The Editorial Board and Editor-in-Chief shall seek the best available experts in the relevant fields for the journal's reviewers. Care will be taken that the selected reviewers have no conflict of interest with regard to the contents of the paper under review.
3. Papers submitted for publication are reviewed by two reviewers, normally employed at two different institutions.
4. The peer review procedure is anonymous. The Editorial Board and Editor-in-Chief of the journal will treat reviewed articles confidentially prior to their publication and they shall under no circumstances reveal the identity of the author to the reviewer or vice versa.
5. The Editorial Board expects the reviewers to have an objective, critical, constructive, helpful, well-intentioned and conscientious approach in the evaluation of the complete paper under review. Reviewers should point out relevant published work which is not yet cited in the paper under review.
6. If the work has been reviewed by the reviewer previously, the reviewer is expected to inform the Editorial Board about this fact. Should the reviewer wish to review the paper a second time, he/she has to inform the Editorial Board about the evaluation given in his/her previous review.
7. The review should be written in the spirit of polite academic communication. In the case of an offensive or derisive review, the Editorial Board or Editor-in-Chief may ask the reviewer to rephrase the review or omit certain sections.
8. In order to be published in the journal, a paper must receive two positive reviews. When a paper receives two positive reviews, its author is still obliged to take into account all the comments made in the reviews and to correct or supplement the work in accordance with them.
9. A paper with two negative reviews will be rejected by the Editorial Board and the reviews will be presented to the author.

10. A paper that receives one negative and one positive review can be rejected by the Editorial Board, especially if the negative review is better argued.
11. A paper given one negative and one positive review can, in accordance with the assessment of the Editorial Board, be submitted to an additional third review.
12. A paper submitted for a third review due to two opposed reviews (positive and negative) will be rejected if the third review is negative.
13. If the third review is positive, all three reviews will be presented to the author. The author is obliged to address the specific comments from all three reviews, including the negative one, and to correct the paper accordingly.
14. The paper can also be submitted for an additional third review if the Editorial Board considers one of the positive reviews to have been written superficially or inadequately.
15. The author may withdraw the paper at any phase of the peer review process if he/she does not wish to take into account the reviewers' comments or for other reasons.