

INSTRUCTIONS FOR REVIEWERS

Before accepting to review a manuscript reviewers should ensure that the manuscript is within their area of expertise and disclose potential conflict of interest. As a rule, reviewers should declare their conflict of interest and recuse themselves from peer review process if they take part in the same project, mentor or are involved in any manner in the preparation of the manuscript to be reviewed. When accepting to review a manuscript, the reviewer also acknowledges that there is no conflict of interest between the duty of a reviewer and any other professional or personal duties.

General structure of the review:

1. Scope and structure of the paper

Reviewers are required to briefly describe the paper in a clear and concise manner. Logical structure of the claims, the style and contextual consistency of the paper should be taken into consideration.

2. General recommendations

Reviewers are required to evaluate the methodological and theoretical-conceptual foundations of the manuscript. Additionally, reviewers should consider if the arguments provided are well-founded and valid by pointing out sound or problematic areas. Reviewers are required to answer the following questions:

- a) *Does the content of the manuscript correspond to the title?*
- b) *Is it necessary to supplement or surmise the manuscript?*
- c) *Does the quality of language make it difficult to understand the manuscript?*
- d) *Does the abstract reflect the content of the manuscript?*

3. Specific recommendations

Similarly to the general recommendations, reviewers may offer some additional comments on specific sections of the manuscript, in particular pertaining to any possible errors.

4. Evaluation of the manuscript and conclusion

When evaluating the quality of the manuscript, reviewers should consider if the manuscript provides an original and scientific contribution to the understanding of the topic and whether it is the relevant to the area it deals with.

We suggest several elements that we consider important when making a decision about manuscript categorisation, particularly with regard to the categorisation of original scientific papers:

- a) Has the author presented the topic accurately, i.e., not overly generalised but focused (limited) on insights that provide some, possibly new scientific knowledge?*
- b) Has the author considered relevant literature with regard to the topic dealt with?*
- c) Has the author offered original attitudes, opinions, criticism, insights and conclusions, in addition to presenting the attitudes of other authors?*
- d) Reviewers should consider highly categorising manuscripts that introduce a particular topic in the Croatian context in a new way, or present important literature dealing with the topic which has previously been recognised in areas with more popular languages but underrepresented in Croatia.*

5. Publishing recommendations

In conclusion, reviewers are required to recommend that the manuscript be accepted, accepted with minor corrections, revised and resubmitted, or declined according to the following criteria:

- a) The manuscript is accepted for publication without any corrections.*
- b) The manuscript is accepted for publication, with minor corrections proposed in the review.*
- c) The manuscript requires major revision and should be resubmitted following the corrections proposed in the review.*
- d) The manuscript is not suitable for the journal. Submit to another publication.*
- e) The manuscript is declined.*

In order to facilitate a timely response to authors, reviewers are requested to generally conduct their reviews within two weeks of receipt. The length of the review, scope of comments and scrutiny is at the discretion of the reviewer. Reviewers are welcome to submit a version of the original manuscript with comments which may be presented to authors.

The reviewing process is a double-blind peer review process. Manuscripts are reviewed anonymously and the identity of the author remains undisclosed until the actual publication while the identity of the reviewer of an individual text may be disclosed only with prior consent of the reviewer.

Categorisation of scientific papers (categorisation is proposed by the author while the final decision is made by the Editorial Board upon two positive reviews):

- 1) **Original scientific paper:** a paper that reviewers and the Editorial Board consider to consist of original previously unpublished theoretical or practical results obtained from original research.
- 2) **Preliminary communication:** a paper containing one or more new scientific data but lacking sufficient details that could be verified as is the case with original scientific papers.
- 3) **Review article:** an original, concise and critical review of the situation and tendencies in the development of a particular field of research with a critical review and evaluation.
- 4) **Professional paper:** a paper which informs and introduces a professional issue or outlines some original solutions in a particular field.