

## Guidelines for Reviewers

Contributing reviewers for the journal *Cris* are asked to comply with the Croatian Ministry of Science, Education and Sport guidelines and consult the Code of Conduct in Publishing (publicly available for the journal *Cris* on the HRČAK websites – <http://hrcak.srce.hr/cris>) when evaluating and categorizing the papers.

Reviewers are obliged to be qualified in the topic of the article when accepting a manuscript for review. If the editorial staff makes a mistake in their assessment and asks a reviewer for a review despite him not being knowledgeable enough in the topic of the article, the reviewer should inform the editorial staff about this and, if possible, suggest an alternative.

If a reviewer accepts an article for review, they need to examine it thoroughly and objectively and endeavor to provide counsel to the author relating to the enhancement of the contents of the text, as well as to the editorial staff in relation to other remarks about the technical and substantial context of the article and its categorization. The journal *Cris* requires its reviewers to fill in certain fields of their form for reviewers, as well as express their opinion and provide counsel in the descriptive part of the form. The endeavor to make the review as detailed as possible, with clearly indicated changes that are suggested or requested, is appreciated. The appraisal of the article includes the assessment of its originality and importance of research, structure of the study, methodology, presentation of the results, power of deduction and general quality of the article.

The review process is confidential. If the reviewers deduct or recognize the identity of the article's author or authors on the basis of its contents and are in any conflict of interest in relation to the authors or the contents of their article, they are obliged to inform the editor about any potential conflict of interest in relation to the text which was submitted for review. In most such cases they have to decline the review of the paper. Reviewers are also responsible for handling the article as a confidential document and publishing the review in due time. The articles should not be shown to anybody without the explicit authorization of the editor. Reviewers have to be tactful and provide the authors with appropriate remarks about the article. They are not allowed to use the data provided in the article under review

for their own research before it is published. If they recognize or deduce the identity of the manuscript's author, reviewers should not directly communicate with them or expose their own identity, unless otherwise agreed with the editor.

Reviewers suggest the category of the article according to the guidelines of the Ministry of Science, Education and Sport:

1. Original scientific paper – contains yet unpublished results of original research which are presented in a way that enables the examination of their accuracy, as well as the accuracy of the analyses and deductions they are based on.
2. Preliminary communication – a scientific article that contains unpublished preliminary results of ongoing scientific research or a theoretically formulated problem and the skeleton of the argumentation, without full elaboration. The communication may include the results of the ongoing scientific research, which require quick publication due to them being of present interest, assuming that a complete paper will be published at a later date.
3. Review – a scientific article that contains a complete account of the state and developmental tendencies of a certain area, together with a critical assessment and evaluation. Specified literature must be exhaustive enough to enable solid insight and involvement in the presented area.
4. Professional paper – contains useful contributions from areas of expertise such as material (without any theoretical, methodological and analytical elaboration), the utilization of already published results of scientific research that focuses on practical usage or their dissemination (education purpose) or a concise and critical overview of a chosen current topic.

The journal Cris also makes public papers from scientific conferences organized by the Historical Society of Križevci Cris (its publisher). Such papers are categorized into the already mentioned categories in accordance with the review process. If a paper which was presented at a scientific conference provides a significant contribution, but cannot be categorized into the aforementioned categories, it can be published as a scientific conference presentation. The editor will warn the reviewer about such a possibility if necessary.

If reviewers require the manuscript to be amended, they can request access to the final version of the manuscript. The recommendation to reject an article for publication needs to be thoroughly justified and substantiated.

The papers undergo at least two instances of review. The paper undergoes a third instance of review if the topic of the article is overly complex or if there are major discrepancies between the evaluations of two reviewers. The final decision on the acceptance of the manuscript for publication and the categorization of the article is made by the editor-in-chief. The decision has to be based on the reviews, and the editor may also ask other members of the editorial staff or the editorial board for their opinion.

The reviews are not remunerated. The editorial staff endeavors to reward the reviewers by publishing their identity in the list of contributing reviewers. The identity of the reviewers is published with their explicit permission in every issue of the journal, without reference to the author or article they reviewed. Reviewers are given a copy of the printed of the journal on which they cooperated.