Bulletin of the International Association for Paleodontology



www.paleodontology.com

PEER REVIEW POLICY

ISSN: 1846-6273 (Online)

Last update: 2021/1

Referees play a vital role in maintaining the high standards of the *Bulletin of the International Association for Paleodontology* and all manuscripts are peer reviewed following the procedure outlined below.

Our review policy is based on the highest international standards and is constantly improved.

Journal management of the *Bulletin of the International Association for Paleodontology* is performed by Open Journal Systems (OJS) at: https://hrcak.srce.hr/ojs/index.php/paleodontology/about.

Initial manuscript evaluation

Initial manuscript evaluation is performed by editor in chief. Editor in chief first evaluates submitted all manuscripts. At this stage manuscripts can be rejected or forwarded reviewers. to Manuscripts rejected at this stage are outside the aims and scope the journal, of insufficiently original or have scientific serious flaws. Manuscripts that meet the minimum criteria are normally passed on to two experts for review.

How the referee is selected?

Referees are matched to the paper according to their expertise. Bulletin of the International Association for Paleodontology has an own referee database which is constantly being updated.

Type of Peer Review

Bulletin of the International Association for Paleodontology employs an open review process: identities of both author and reviewer are disclosed.

Duties of Reviewers

Referees are asked to evaluate each section of the manuscript using OJS journal management system and online review form. Review form is shown on the next page.

Language correction is not part of the peer review process, but referees may, if so wish, suggest corrections to the manuscript. Authors are responsible for language correctness.

How long does the review process take?

The time required for the review process is dependent on the response of the referees. Referees are asked

to finish their reviews within 3 weeks.

Editors Decision

After first round of reviews a manuscript can be:

- accepted,
- accepted with suggestions for revision,
- accepted only if adequately revised and rereviewed
- rejected.

At least two reviewers should recommend acceptance of the further manuscript for processing. If one reviewer recommends rejection and the second acceptance, manuscript will be sent to the third reviewer. The Editors' decision will be sent to the author with recommendations made by the referees. Revised manuscripts might be returned to the initial referees who may then request another revision of a manuscript.

www.paleodontology.com

PEER REVIEW POLICY

PEER REVIEW EVALUATION FORM

Peer reviewer: 2. Manuscript		3. Date of manuscript			4. Peer review		
number: submission:					deadline:		
5. Title of manuscript:							
	Original	original scientific article			☐ Short communication		
6. Category:	☐ Clinical article☐ Review article			☐ Case report			
(piease crieck box)				☐ Other			
(plea:	se check box)	eck box) YES NO		(please check box) YES No			NO
7. Title of paper:				8. Abstract:			
Clear, concise					, informative		
9. Introduction:				10. Objective(s):			
Clear, concise				Clear			
11. Methods:				Important			
Methods appropriate				12. Materials:		_	
Precisely documented				Numbers adequate			
13. Statistics:		_	_		adequate		
Methods appropriate				14. Results:			
Interpretation correct				All results presented			
15. Table(s):				Without bias and repetition			
All necessary				16. Figure(s			
Legend(s) clear				All necessary			
17. Discussion:				Legend(s) clear 18. Reference to previous work:			
Clear, concise Without repetition				Complete			
Supported by data				Up to date			
19. Conclusions:				Accurate			
Clear, concise				Too many			
CONFIDENTIAL COMMENTS	TO THE	EDITO	R				
20. Professional Judgment:	(please check bo	ox)					
Concept(s) of study:			New		onfirmatory		
Importance of study:			High		loderate □	Lo	W
Scientific quality of study:			High	\square N	loderate □	Lo	W
Study within the scope of	the Journa	al 🗆	Yes	□ N	0		
Od Final Bases and Jackson							
21. Final Recommendation:	please check bo	x)					
☐ Acceptable							
 ☐ Acceptable with suggestions for revision ☐ Acceptable only if adequately revised and requiring re-review 							
□ Reject							
22. Comments to the Editor: (please continue on additional page if necessary)							
—— O THE LOTTE (please continue on additional page if fieldssaly)							
23. Comments to the Author	(s): (please of	ontinue on a	idditional nage if	necessary)			
	(2). (piodos o			,			