**GUIDELINES FOR REVIEWERS AND REVIEW FORM**

The Editorial Board has asked for your review because they think that, with your expertise, you will be able to assist them in decision-making regarding publication or rejection of the article. In our journal, double-blind review is conducted. Authors are provided with the content of reviews, but reviews are anonymised prior to being delivered to authors.

Reviews are written in the **review form** which is enclosed below. Please pay particular attention to the following elements in the form:

(1) In the section “Article classification”, you are required to determine the type of scientific and professional communication to which the article belongs using the definitions offered in the form. Avoid using classification for determining the value of the article: articles which are not high-quality representatives of their type should be returned to the author for revision or rejected.

(2) In the section “Reviewer recommendations”, specify whether you suggest publication of the reviewed paper and under what conditions.

(3) Arguments for evaluation of the paper should be written in the table entitled “Justification of Paper Evaluation and Recommendations for Authors”. The text in the table should be constructive, objectively written, supported, and sufficiently thorough in order to assist the Editorial Board with decision-making and authors with improvement of the paper. Criticism of the paper should be directed at the conducted research or its description and, under no circumstances, at the authors of the paper.

You are expected to keep confidential all information relating to the paper and regard it as privileged information. As a reviewer you are obliged to inform the Editorial Board about any observed form of unattributed overlaps of words, ideas, and data in the papers under your consideration with other works with which you are familiar, but also about any other form of justified suspicions in unethical practices of the author.

If you estimate that the content of the article is out of your scope of qualifications, that you cannot review it within the specific time limit, or that the review could cause a conflict of interest, please inform the Editorial Board thereof in due time.

**REVIEW FORM**

**General Information**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Article title** |  | |
| **Number of text pages** |  | |
| **Research area** |  | |
| **Abstract in the language of the article** | Yes / No | |
| **Abstract in another language** | Yes / No | **Abstract language** |
| **List of sources and literature** | Yes / No | |
| **Appendices**  [Indicate the contained appendices and specify whether they are in the body of the article or at the end of the article.] | [e.g. textual sources / tables / graphs / more complex visuals (e.g. photos / drawings / maps)] | |

**Article Classification and Reviewer Recommendations**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Article classification**  [Specify the type of scientific or professional communication to which the article belongs. Avoid using classification for determining the value of the article. Articles which are not high-quality representatives of their type should be returned to the author for revision or rejected.] | 1. Original scientific paper   [*Contains previously unpublished and for scientific community relevant original research presented in the objectively confidential way.*]   1. Preliminary communication   [*Short communication about important scientific discovery which obliges authors to publish the original scientific paper subsequently.*]   1. Review article   [*Contains the original critical review of the research in the scientific area in which the author is actively involved.*]   1. Professional paper   [*Contains a brief critical review on a particular topic with the aim of popularisation.*]   1. Other: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ |
| **Reviewer recommendations** | 1. Accept in the present form 2. Accept after revision (not necessary to resubmit for review) 3. Accept after revision (before acceptance resubmit for review) 4. Significantly revise and resubmit for review 5. Reject |

**Justification of Paper Evaluation and Recommendations for Authors**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Suitability of article title** |  |
| **Abstract clarity** |  |
| **Establishing the research problem; theoretical framework and methodology; quality and confidentiality of argumentation** |  |
| **Readability: text and language clarity** |  |
| **Choice of literature** |  |
| **Article originality and relevance for scientific community** |  |
| **Other remarks** |  |

**REVIEWER PERSONAL DATA**

[Not to be delivered to authors]

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Date of review** |  |
| **Reviewer** |  |
| **Institution** |  |
| **Title** |  |
| **Scientist registration number**  [for scientists outside Croatia] |  |
| **Address and contact information** |  |
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