

INSTRUCTIONS FOR REVIEWERS

This document is based on the 1999 COPE Guidelines, the 2003 COPE Code of Conduct, the 2007 COPE Best Practice Guidelines, the 2011 COPE Code of Conduct and Best Practice for Journal Editors, the 2014 Principles of Transparency and Best Practice in Scholarly Publishing, Recommendations on ethics in publishing by the World Association of Medical Editors. (WAME), Financial Theory and Practice, Ethical guidelines for journal publishing (http://www.ijf.hr/download_file.php?file=eticke-smjernice.pdf), Libri & Liberi, Ethical procedure and editorial guidelines for publication magazine (http://www.librietliberi.org/wp/wp-content/uploads/2015/05/Eti%C4%8Dki-postupnik_LL_2015.pdf)

1. Focus of the Journal

Acta Iadertina is a scientific journal published by the Department of Pedagogy and the Department of Philosophy of the University of Zadar. It publishes works within the field of pedagogy and philosophy, as well as interdisciplinary works within related social sciences and humanities. Since 2003/2004, the journal has been published as a yearbook, while from 2014/2015 it is published twice a year. The journal has an international editorial board. It is published in a printed version and in an electronic form available on platforms such as Morepress (<https://morepress.unizd.hr/journals/index.php/actaiadertina>) and Hrčak (<https://hrcak.srce.hr/actaiadertina>)

All received papers are subject to a review process. Reviewers are scientists from the field (or branch) that the author(s) of the article write about. In doing so, double-blind reviews are carried out.

The magazine only publishes peer-reviewed papers. The reviewers are

recognized domestic and foreign scientists from the field (or branch) that the author(s) work on. There is no fee for the peer review process, and the journal keeps track of the peer review process. At the request of the reviewer, it is possible to issue a review certificate for the purpose of scientific advancement.

2. Peer-review process

The editorial board accepts unpublished manuscripts only, written in English or Croatian language. Authors can submit their manuscripts prepared for publication in the journal *Acta Iadertina* throughout the year, only in the digital form via e-mail: acta.iadertina@unizd.hr, or via Morepress, the publishing platform of the University of Zadar (<https://morepress.unizd.hr/journals/index.php/actaiadertina/about/submissions>).

All papers undergo a first editorial check in order to assess the compliance of the work with the goals and thematic areas of the journal, and to meet the criteria of scientific/professional quality. All papers that pass the first editorial review are subject to a double-blind review process.

According to the evaluation of the reviewers, the work is sent back to the address of the Editorial Board, which forwards the recommendations of the reviewers to the author(s) of the work. The author/s should act according to the instructions of the reviewers and edit the entire text according to the propositions of the journal. In the revised version of the work, according to the recommendations of the reviewers, the author/s mark the changes in red and send a statement about the changes made in a separate Word document, in which they state which recommendations of the reviewers were taken into account and how, and which ones were not, with an explanation.

The final decision on the category of the work is made by the Editorial Board on the basis of reviews.

The work can be published only if, according to the assessment of both reviewers, it is accepted for publication and the author/s implement possible changes according to the recommendations of the reviewers.

Verification of the originality of the work – all received works are subjected to detection of concordance with the existing literature using the Turnitin system. In case of suspicion of plagiarism and redundancy, the

Editorial Board will act in accordance with the recommendations of the international Association for Ethics in Publishing (COPE): <https://publicationethics.org/resources/flowcharts>.

When writing a review, reviewers should pay attention to several guidelines. Papers published in the *Acta Iadertina* journal should be scientifically relevant within the thematic areas of this journal, theoretically based and methodologically correct. In addition to the general opinion about the work (observed good points, shortcomings, recommendations for improving the quality of the work, etc.), the editors forward to the reviewer a form in which the guidelines for the content of the review, a brief evaluation and categorization of the work are specified.

Guidelines for the **Content of the Review**:

1. Title – is it adequate?
2. Summary – does it describe well the aim, methodology, the results and conclusions of the work?
3. Theoretical basis – is the work theoretically based and does it contain a satisfactory overview of the previous findings?
4. Methodology – does it correspond to the subject? Is the goal of the work clearly stated? Were the appropriate research methods, data collection and processing techniques chosen (in case it is an empirical research)?
5. Professional terminology – is it well chosen and correctly used?
6. Errors – are there errors concerning theoretical presentation, processing and interpretation of data or graphic attachments?
7. Uniformity – is the scope of individual parts of the work appropriate?
8. Repetition – are there any unnecessary repetitions (if any, where, and which)?
9. Clarity – is the text written in a clear and logical manner (without contradictions)?
10. Conclusion – is it logical? Is it based on the obtained results?
11. Literature – is it adequate and correctly referenced?

A short assessment implies choosing one of the offered recommendations for publication:

- A – accept without change
- B – accept after implemented proposals for change
- C – significantly or completely rework before acceptance
- D – reject

If the work is recommended for publication, the reviewers suggest categorizing the work according to the following categories:

- **Original scientific paper** contains hitherto unpublished original research presented in an objectively verifiable manner.

Preliminary report contains new results of (scientific) research, which require rapid publication. It does not have to enable verification of the presented results.

- **Review** must be an original, concise, and critical presentation of an area, or one of its parts, in which the author(s) themselves actively participate. The role of the author's original contributions in the field in relation to already published works must be emphasized, as well as an overview of these works.
- **Conference paper**, previously presented at a conference, must be published in the form of a complete article and only if it was not previously published in an anthology or a collection of the conference.
- **Professional paper** contains useful contributions from a specific profession and does not have to represent an original research.

The journal also publishes reviews of domestic and foreign editions, not older than four years, counting up to the day of receipt of the review by the Editorial Office. On the first page, the name and surname of the author of the presented work, the title of the work (subtitle) and the following information are given: name of the publisher, place of publication, year of publication and number of pages.

3. Code of Conduct for Reviewers

The Code of Conduct for Reviewers is designed to provide a set of minimum standards to which reviewers should adhere.

- **Contribution to editorial decisions**

The reviewer helps the editor in making editorial decisions and through their communication with the authors can also help the authors in improving the quality of their work. The reviewer's task is to critically and constructively assess the received work and to provide reasoned remarks and suggestions related to the conducted research and the way it is presented in the work.

- **Timeliness**

A selected reviewer who believes he is not qualified to review the research described in the paper or knows that he will not be able to prepare a review in a timely manner should inform the Editorial Board and withdraw from the review process. The decision to accept or reject the review of the paper should be communicated to the Editorial Board within seven days of receiving the invitation.

- **Confidentiality**

Each paper received for review should be treated as a confidential document.

- **Standards of objectivity**

Reviews should be done objectively. Criticisms directed at the author is not appropriate. Reviewers should express their views with clear arguments.

- **Citation of sources**

The reviewer should recognize significant coincidences and similarities with already published works in which they have personal knowledge, about which they should warn the author(s) and the editor. Any statement taken from other already published sources should be properly cited or paraphrased.

- **Disclosure of information and conflict of interest**

The reviewer should not use unpublished data presented in the submitted paper for his own research without the written consent of the author(s). Information or ideas obtained during the review process must remain con-

fidential and must not be used for personal gain. Reviewers should not agree to review papers in which they have a conflict of interest due to competition, collaboration, or other relationships and connections with any of the authors, companies, or institutions associated with the work.