

## REVIEW PROCEDURE

*Croatica* publishes research papers and, in accordance with academic standards (see [Publication Ethics and Malpractice Statement](#)), conducts (an international) review procedure that has several steps.

Upon receiving a manuscript, the editorial board decides whether to accept it or not.

If the editorial board does not accept the manuscript, it returns it to the author with an explanation regarding the rejection.

If the editorial board assesses that the manuscript potentially carries relevance, it sends it to two reviewers but withholds any author information (double-blind peer review).

If one of the reviews is negative, the manuscript is sent to a third review.

Reviewers assess the manuscripts on a scale from 0 (unacceptable) to 5 (excellent) according to the following criteria:

1. clarity of structure and style, and the proportional distribution of the different sections in the manuscript
2. adequacy of approach and methodology
3. relevance of the manuscript and its possible implications
4. originality of approach
5. meeting formal criteria (whether the manuscript contains all necessary parts, a systematized Works Cited page, and whether its grammar and spelling meet the standardized language)
6. overall assessment.

Reviewers will provide a general recommendation for the publication of the manuscript, a suggestion to the manuscript's categorization and comments in case the manuscript needs revision.

Manuscripts with the decision to publish and reviewer comments, as well as with possible editorial comments, are sent to authors within the given time-frame.

The authors should revise their manuscript and produce its final version in accordance with reviewer and editorial recommendations.

After receiving the final version of the manuscript, the manuscript is sent to formatting and proof-reading.

## REVIEW FORM

### Basic paper information

Title	
Number of standard pages (1800 characters with spaces)	
Summary in original language (YES/NO)	
Summary in foreign language (YES/NO, which language)	
Bibliography (YES/NO)	

### Paper review

Grade the manuscript on a scale from 5 (excellent) to 0 (unacceptable), according to the listed criteria. Highlight, bold and underline the suggested grade (e.g. **5**).

*The paper draws on relevant bibliography and recent research and quotes them appropriately.*

5	4	3	2	1	0
Excellent	Very good	Good	Poor	Very poor	Unacceptable

*The topic is relevant and the paper has potential implications in the relevant field and/or other fields.*

5	4	3	2	1	0
Excellent	Very good	Good	Poor	Very poor	Unacceptable

*The paper's theoretical framework, methodology and terminology are appropriate, the paper is well balanced and its scientific contribution is clearly distinguished from previous research.*

5	4	3	2	1	0
Excellent	Very good	Good	Poor	Very poor	Unacceptable

*The language of the paper is correct and precise; the argument is presented clearly.*

5	4	3	2	1	0
Excellent	Very good	Good	Poor	Very poor	Unacceptable

*The paper's content or approach are original.*

5	4	3	2	1	0
Excellent	Very good	Good	Poor	Very poor	Unacceptable

### Overall grade

5	4	3	2	1	0
Excellent	Very good	Good, minor revisions needed	Poor, major revisions needed	Very poor, major part of the paper should be revised or rewritten	Unacceptable

### *Reviewer's opinion*

Comment on the paper, elaborate on your grade and list your objections, remarks and suggestions. (Editorial board will not accept unelaborated reviews.)

### *Suggested categorization and publishing recommendation*

*Original research paper* presents authentic results of theoretical or practical research, which can be completely original or they can confirm or disprove some previous research i.e., they can be fundamental or applicable. The quality of an original research paper is determined with respect to the quality of its insights, the explication and interpretation of facts, and the strength of its argumentation.

*Review paper* presents a critical overview or a meta-analysis of a certain topic. The quality of a review paper is determined with respect to the scope of the reviewed topic, the explication of important facts, the quality of the conducted analysis and synthesis, meta-analytic argumentation, suggestions for further research of the topic etc.

*Professional paper* presents a summary of someone else's research, previously published and known, for the purpose of disseminating scientific knowledge, demonstrating its application in solving specific problems or for practical and educational purposes.

I suggest that the paper should be (bold): 1) accepted and published 2) accepted and published with suggested revisions 3) rejected, not published	I suggest the following categorization (bold): 1) original research paper 2) review paper 3) professional paper
---	--

### *Reviewer information*

Name, Surname	
Academic title	
Author ID (MZO)	
Institution	
Address	
E-mail	

Place and date of review

\_\_\_\_\_

Reviewer's signature

\_\_\_\_\_