

GUIDELINES FOR REVIEWERS

(according to the [Standard](#) of Ministry of Science and Education of Republic of Croatia)

A reviewer should critically but constructively assess the article and write comments and advice on the research and the paper in order to help author(s) improve their work and advise editorial board on the subsequent editorial process. Assessment of the paper includes an assessment of originality and the importance of research, organization of the paper, methodology, presentation of the results, force of conclusion and the overall quality of paper.

Editorial board of the journal *Arhaeologia Adriatica* conducts a double-blind peer review process (i.e. neither the reviewers nor the authors know each other's identities). The final decision on the manuscript rests with the editorial board.

The reviewer can make one of the following recommendations regarding the suitability of the article for publication:

- accept the manuscript in its present form
- accept with suggested revisions
- thoroughly revise and resubmit for another review
- reject (if reviewers suggest not publishing the article, they are obliged to provide a more detailed explanation of the reasons for not publishing).

Subject of review are the articles which can be divided into four categories suggested by the reviewers:

- *Original scientific paper* contains so far unpublished results of original research presented so that their accuracy can be checked as well as the accuracy of analysis and statements on which they are based;
- *Preliminary communication* contains unpublished results of scientific research especially those in progress assuming latter publication of the complete work. It can be without sufficient detail to enable verification as in original research papers;

- *Review paper* contains a comprehensive overview of the status and trends of development in specific scientific areas (and/or certain scientific theme) with a critical review and assessment;
- *Professional paper* contains knowledge and experience relevant to a particular profession but has no scientific characteristics i. e. it does not bring original results of the author's research, but it uses already published results which it systemizes and explains.

If a reviewer is unable to evaluate the paper from whatever reason they are obliged to inform the editorial board as soon as possible. In that case the reviewer may suggest another scholar as a reviewer. Reviewers are required to inform the editor about any potential conflict of interest in relation to authors or the content of their paper that they were asked to review. In most such cases they should be excused from reviewing the paper. Other responsibilities of reviewers include the handling of paper as confidential file and completing the reviews on time. Reviewers are not allowed to use research data described in a paper that they received for review for their own research. They should be respectable in their comments of the paper addressed to the author and should not communicate directly with authors (unless that is agreed with the editorial board).

Authors may suggest reviewers (but the editorial board is not obliged to invite suggested reviewers). Also, the editorial board may acknowledge an author's suggestion to omit certain persons from the review process, provided that this request is clearly reasoned and applicable.

A filled and signed review form should be e-mailed to archaeologia.adriatica@unizd.hr or mailed to the Editorial board address.

Once the review is received, editorial board decides on the subsequent procedure.

According to the needs of the reviewer, the Editorial Board may issue a certificate to the author for participation in the review process.

Reviewers are not paid.