



Scientific Journal of Entomology
Publisher: Croatian Entomological Society,
established in 1974

With the support of:
Department of Biology and Faculty of
Agrobiotechnical Sciences Osijek
Josip Juraj Strossmayer University of Osijek



GUIDELINES FOR REVIEWERS

The Code of Conduct for Reviewers has been developed to establish a set of minimum standards that reviewers are expected to follow.

Before accepting a review assignment, reviewers should consider whether the manuscript falls within their area of expertise and check for any potential conflicts of interest. As a general rule, it is not acceptable for a reviewer to be involved in the same research project, to be the author's supervisor, or to have otherwise participated in the preparation of the manuscript under review. By accepting the review assignment, the reviewer confirms that there is no conflict of interest between their role as a reviewer and any other professional or personal commitments.

An invitation to review a manuscript should be regarded as a professional honour.

1. Peer Review Policy

The peer review process is an essential component of ensuring the scientific quality, credibility, and integrity of the articles published in a scientific journal. Its purpose is to assess the scientific merit, originality, methodological soundness, and relevance of manuscripts to the journal's scope. Reviewers are expected to evaluate manuscripts impartially, objectively, responsibly, and in accordance with the principles of academic integrity. All comments and recommendations must be clearly justified and supported by specific examples from the manuscript or relevant scientific literature. Reviewers are required to maintain the confidentiality of manuscripts and all information obtained during the peer review process. Manuscripts and their contents must not be shared with unauthorized persons or used for personal benefit or the reviewer's own research. Reviewers should disclose any potential conflicts of interest that could affect their impartiality. They should also alert the editorial office to possible irregularities, including suspected plagiarism, data manipulation, inappropriate presentation of results, or other forms of scientific misconduct. The final decision to accept a manuscript, reject it, or request revisions is made by the editorial office on the basis of the review reports, the editorial assessment, and the journal's editorial policy.



Scientific Journal of Entomology
Publisher: Croatian Entomological Society,
established in 1974

With the support of:
Department of Biology and Faculty of
Agrobiotechnical Sciences Osijek
Josip Juraj Strossmayer University of Osijek

2. Initial Assessment of Manuscripts

Before a manuscript is sent for peer review, the editorial office conducts an initial assessment to determine whether it falls within the journal's aims and scope and meets the basic requirements for scientific publication.

The initial assessment considers the following aspects:

- the alignment of the manuscript's subject matter with the journal's aims and scope;
- the scientific relevance and originality of the manuscript and its potential contribution to existing scientific knowledge;
- the clarity of the research problem, objectives, and, where applicable, research hypotheses;
- the basic structure of the manuscript, the quality of the abstract, and the clarity of the text;
- compliance with the technical instructions for authors and manuscript preparation requirements;
- the basic suitability of the research approach, methods, and presentation of results;
- compliance with ethical principles in scientific research and publishing.

If a manuscript fails to meet the basic requirements for scientific publication or contains serious deficiencies that prevent further assessment, the editorial office may reject it without sending it for external peer review. In cases involving minor formal or technical deficiencies, the editorial office may request revisions before forwarding the manuscript to reviewers.

A positive initial assessment does not guarantee acceptance for publication; it means only that the manuscript meets the requirements for further scientific evaluation.

Manuscripts that meet the editorial criteria are sent to at least two expert reviewers for evaluation. One reviewer is selected from Croatia and the other from abroad. If the first two review reports contain conflicting recommendations, the manuscript is sent for a third review, usually to an international reviewer.

3. Type of Peer Review

Entomologia Croatica employs a peer review process designed to ensure an independent and expert assessment of manuscript quality. The type of peer review is determined by the journal's editorial policy and is clearly stated in the instructions for authors and reviewers.



Scientific Journal of Entomology
Publisher: Croatian Entomological Society,
established in 1974

With the support of:
Department of Biology and Faculty of
Agrobiotechnical Sciences Osijek
Josip Juraj Strossmayer University of Osijek

Single-blind peer review means that the reviewers remain anonymous to the author(s) during and after the review process, while the authors' identities are known to the reviewers. All manuscripts undergo a review process. Original research articles, review articles (both professional and scientific), professional articles, preliminary communications, and short scientific communications undergo external peer review by two independent external reviewers. Domestic and international reviewers are represented in approximately equal proportions. The journal applies a single-blind peer review process, in which reviewers know the identity of the authors, while the authors do not know the identity of the reviewers. If the reviewers' recommendations differ substantially, the Editor-in-Chief may request an additional independent review. Other types of submissions, such as editorials, biographies, essays, news items, notes, obituaries, bibliographies, conference abstracts, and letters to the editor, undergo editorial review.

4. Invitations to Reviewers

The journal's editorial office invites reviewers on the basis of their expertise, scientific qualifications, and experience in the subject area addressed by the manuscript. The aim is to ensure an independent, objective, and expert assessment of the scientific quality of each submitted manuscript. The invitation to review includes basic information about the manuscript, the deadline for submitting the review report, and instructions for conducting the review. The invited reviewer is responsible for assessing whether the manuscript falls within their area of expertise, whether they can complete the review within the specified timeframe, and whether any potential conflicts of interest exist. Reviewers must inform the editorial office of any circumstances that could affect their impartiality. If they are unable to accept the invitation, they should notify the editorial office promptly so that another suitable reviewer can be appointed. By accepting the invitation, reviewers undertake to conduct the review professionally and objectively, in accordance with the ethical principles of scholarly publishing, to maintain the confidentiality of the manuscript, and to submit their review report within the agreed timeframe.

5. Selection of Reviewers

Reviewers are selected by the editorial office on the basis of their expertise, scientific competence, and knowledge of the field to which the manuscript belongs. The selection takes into account their academic qualifications, relevant research experience, previous publications, and familiarity with the methodology used in the manuscript.



Scientific Journal of Entomology
Publisher: Croatian Entomological Society,
established in 1974

With the support of:
Department of Biology and Faculty of
Agrobiotechnical Sciences Osijek
Josip Juraj Strossmayer University of Osijek

Selected reviewers should possess the appropriate expertise to assess the subject matter, research approach, data analysis, and conclusions of the manuscript. Where necessary, the editorial office may appoint reviewers with different specializations to ensure a comprehensive assessment. The editorial office strives to ensure that reviewers are independent, competent, and impartial, while avoiding placing an unnecessary burden on individual reviewers. Reviewers' identities are protected in accordance with the peer review model and the journal's confidentiality policy. The selection of reviewers must promote transparency, impartiality, and scientific credibility and ensure that publication decisions are based on the quality and scientific merit of the manuscript.

6. Review Process

The purpose of peer review is to assess the scientific merit, originality, relevance, and methodological soundness of a manuscript, as well as its suitability for publication in the journal. Reviewers should conduct a critical and constructive assessment of the manuscript, taking into account the journal's aims and scope. Review reports must be clear, reasoned, and constructive. Comments should be specific and, where possible, refer to the relevant page, section, or line of the manuscript. Reviewers should distinguish between major scientific and methodological shortcomings and minor linguistic, stylistic, and technical issues. At the end of the review report, reviewers provide a recommendation to the editorial office concerning acceptance, acceptance subject to minor revisions, reconsideration following major revisions, or rejection of the manuscript. The final publication decision is made by the editorial office on the basis of the review reports and the journal's editorial policy. Throughout the review process, reviewers must maintain the confidentiality of the manuscript and all information obtained during the review. The manuscript must not be shared with unauthorized persons or used for personal benefit. Reviewers must also alert the editorial office to any suspected plagiarism, data manipulation, or other breaches of scientific ethics. By submitting a manuscript, authors confirm that they have checked and edited the text for language and spelling and accept full responsibility for its linguistic and terminological accuracy. Detailed instructions and the review form are provided to reviewers through direct communication with the Editorial Board.

7. Handling Disagreements Between Reviewers

Each manuscript is subject to two independent external reviews. If the reviewers' recommendations differ, the Editor-in-Chief considers both reports, their reasoned comments, and the scientific quality of the manuscript before deciding on the appropriate course of action. If the reviewers' recommendations differ substantially, the Editor-in-Chief may seek an additional independent review. The final decision to accept the manuscript for publication,



Scientific Journal of Entomology
Publisher: Croatian Entomological Society,
established in 1974

With the support of:
Department of Biology and Faculty of
Agrobiotechnical Sciences Osijek
Josip Juraj Strossmayer University of Osijek

return it to the authors for revision, or reject it is made on the basis of all available review reports and the editorial assessment.

8. Duration of the Peer Review Process

Reviewers are expected to submit their review reports within 21 days of accepting the review invitation, unless a different deadline has been set by the editorial office. If a reviewer is unable to meet the deadline, they must inform the editorial office promptly. In the event of a delay or a reviewer's unavailability, the editorial office may appoint another reviewer. Reviewers assess the quality, originality, scientific soundness, and relevance of the manuscript and recommend acceptance, revision, or rejection. If revisions are required, the authors are given a deadline for submitting the revised manuscript. Where necessary, the revised manuscript is sent for another round of peer review. The process may involve up to three rounds of review. The peer review process generally takes four to six weeks and may extend to a maximum of 20 weeks, depending on reviewer availability, manuscript complexity, and the extent of revisions required. The Editor-in-Chief makes the final decision to accept or reject the manuscript. The average time from manuscript submission to publication in *Entomologia Croatica* ranges from one to 12 months, given that the journal is published at least once a year. The editorial office strives to ensure a transparent and timely process and to keep authors regularly informed of their manuscript's status.

9. Use of Artificial Intelligence

When using artificial intelligence tools, reviewers must comply with the journal's rules on confidentiality and data protection. Confidential manuscripts and review materials must not be uploaded to artificial intelligence tools without prior approval from the editorial office and appropriate assurances regarding the protection of confidentiality. Artificial intelligence tools must not replace the reviewer's own expert judgment. Reviewers remain fully responsible for the content, accuracy, and recommendations contained in their review reports.

REVIEW GUIDELINES

Reviewers assess the quality, originality, scientific and professional contribution, and relevance of manuscripts in accordance with the journal's aims and scope. The assessment is conducted using the review form, with the specified elements evaluated and the ratings justified by specific comments.

1. Criteria for Manuscript Evaluation

Reviewers assess manuscripts according to the following criteria:



Scientific Journal of Entomology
Publisher: Croatian Entomological Society,
established in 1974

With the support of:
Department of Biology and Faculty of
Agrobiotechnical Sciences Osijek
Josip Juraj Strossmayer University of Osijek

Scientific and Professional Contribution – the originality of the work, the relevance of the subject, and its contribution to the field of research, biology education, and interdisciplinary approaches.

Research Purpose – the clarity of the objectives, research questions or hypotheses, and the soundness of the theoretical framework.

Research Design and Methodology – the appropriateness of the research approach, the clarity of the methodological description, and its consistency with the research objectives.

Data Analysis and Results – the clarity of the presentation of results and the extent to which the conclusions are supported by the analyses conducted.

Theoretical and Practical Relevance – the validity of the conclusions and the contribution of the work to further research, teaching practice, or educational policy.

Organization, Structure, and Language – the logical organization and clarity of the manuscript, the appropriateness of the title and abstract, the quality of figures and other illustrative materials, the use of scientific terminology, and the relevance of the cited literature.

Each criterion should be rated using the scale provided in the review form, ranging from unacceptable to excellent.

2. Comments and Recommendations to Authors

The review report should contain clear, reasoned, and constructive comments that help authors improve their manuscript. Comments should address the following aspects:

Overall Assessment of the Manuscript – highlight its strengths, originality, scientific contribution, structure, and clarity.

General Comments – assess the relevance of the subject, the theoretical and methodological soundness, the quality of the data, the persuasiveness of the argumentation, and the validity of the discussion and conclusions.

Specific Comments – provide concrete suggestions for revisions, additional explanations, summarizing or omitting particular sections, and correcting possible errors.

All comments should be clearly justified and, where possible, supported by specific examples from the manuscript or relevant scientific literature. Comments should be professional, precise, and focused on the content of the work.



3. Recommendation for Publication

Based on the assessment, reviewers provide a clear recommendation:

- Accept for publication without changes.
- Accept for publication subject to minor revisions.
- Accept for publication subject to major revisions.
- Invite resubmission.
- Reject.

If publication or continuation of the review process is recommended, reviewers should also suggest an article category: original scientific article, short communication, preliminary communication, review article, professional article, conference presentation, conference abstract, review (case report), or case study. The recommendation must be justified by the findings of the review. If rejection is recommended, the reasons and major shortcomings must be clearly stated.

4. Duration and Stages of the Peer Review Process

The usual deadline for the first round of review is up to four weeks. If revisions are required, the editor may assess minor changes independently, while more substantial revisions are generally sent back to the reviewers. The review process may involve up to three rounds, depending on the extent of the revisions required. Following reassessment, reviewers may recommend acceptance of the revised manuscript, request further revisions, or recommend rejection. The Editor-in-Chief makes the final decision to accept or reject the manuscript. Reviewers should act impartially, maintain confidentiality, and conduct themselves professionally, basing their recommendations on expert criteria and the journal's aims.

ETHICAL GUIDELINES

Peer Review Process

Original scientific papers submitted for publication are evaluated by two reviewers. Authors may suggest the names and contact details (email addresses) of two experts in the relevant scientific field as potential reviewers for their manuscript. Only manuscripts receiving positive review reports are eligible for publication. The Editor-in-Chief makes the final decision on whether a manuscript is accepted for publication.



Scientific Journal of Entomology
Publisher: Croatian Entomological Society,
established in 1974

With the support of:
Department of Biology and Faculty of
Agrobiotechnical Sciences Osijek
Josip Juraj Strossmayer University of Osijek

Contribution to Editorial Decisions

Through their expert and objective assessments, reviewers assist the editorial office in making decisions concerning the acceptance, revision, or rejection of manuscripts. Their comments and constructive recommendations help improve the quality, clarity, and scientific merit of manuscripts and enable authors to strengthen their work.

Timeliness

Reviewers are required to complete their reviews within the agreed timeframe. If they consider that they lack the appropriate expertise to evaluate a manuscript or will be unable to complete the review within the specified period, they must notify the editorial office without delay and withdraw from the review process so that another suitable reviewer can be appointed.

Confidentiality

Manuscripts received for review are considered confidential documents. They must not be shared with unauthorized persons, nor may their contents be discussed outside the peer review process without the editorial office's permission. Reviewers must maintain the confidentiality of all information and ideas contained in the manuscript and must not use them for personal benefit. Reviewers' identities are also confidential; therefore, reviewers must not disclose their names or contact details in comments intended for the authors.

Objectivity

The peer review process must be conducted objectively, impartially, and on the basis of scientific and professional criteria. Reviewers are required to express their opinions, assessments, and comments clearly, with reasoned justifications and in a constructive manner. Their assessments should focus on the scientific quality, originality, methodological soundness, and relevance of the manuscript, as well as the clarity of the presentation of results and conclusions. Personal criticism of authors, inappropriate comments, and judgments unrelated to the scientific content of the work are unacceptable. Reviewers should formulate their comments in a way that enables authors to understand the identified shortcomings and, where appropriate, address them to improve the quality of the manuscript. Objectivity and professionalism in peer review are essential to ensuring the fair evaluation of scientific work, the credibility of published findings, and the integrity of scholarly publishing.

Citation of Sources and Identification of Plagiarism

Reviewers are required to pay attention to the proper citation of sources and to identify possible forms of plagiarism and academic misconduct in the manuscripts assigned to them. They should draw authors' attention to relevant published work that has not been cited in the manuscript and ensure that claims concerning previously published observations, results, findings, or arguments are supported by appropriate bibliographic references. If reviewers identify substantial similarities or overlap between the manuscript under review and other



Scientific Journal of Entomology
Publisher: Croatian Entomological Society,
established in 1974

With the support of:
Department of Biology and Faculty of
Agrobiotechnical Sciences Osijek
Josip Juraj Strossmayer University of Osijek

published or unpublished works of which they are aware, they must inform the Editor-in-Chief. As far as possible, reviewers should identify any form of plagiarism or improper citation and contribute through their actions to safeguarding academic integrity, the credibility of scientific publications, and the ethical standards of scholarly publishing.

Conflicts of Interest

Reviewers must ensure impartiality and objectivity throughout the peer review process and promptly inform the editor of any actual or potential conflict of interest arising from competitive, collaborative, or other professional or personal relationships with the authors, companies, or institutions associated with the manuscript. If a conflict of interest exists, reviewers should decline the invitation to review to ensure an impartial assessment of the work. Confidential information, unpublished materials, and ideas obtained during the peer review process must be kept confidential and must not be used in the reviewer's own research or for personal or professional advantage without the author's explicit written consent. These obligations also apply to reviewers who have declined an invitation to review. Compliance with these principles is essential to maintaining trust in the peer review process, ensuring impartial editorial decisions, and safeguarding the integrity of scholarly publishing.



Entomologia Croatica

Znanstveni časopis Hrvatskog entomološkog društva (HED)

Scientific journal of the Croatian Entomological Society (CES)

RECENZENTSKI LIST **REVIEWER'S FORM**

Naslov rukopisa
Manuscript title



Scientific Journal of Entomology
Publisher: Croatian Entomological Society,
established in 1974

With the support of:
Department of Biology and Faculty of
Agrobiotechnical Sciences Osijek
Josip Juraj Strossmayer University of Osijek

Šifra rukopisa Manuscript code		
Rad ima znanstvenu vrijednost i od interesa je za čitatelje časopisa Entomologia Croatica <i>The paper has scientific value and is of interest to the readers of Entomologia Croatica</i>	Da Yes	Ne No
Pruž a li uvod dovoljan uvid u sadržaj rada i njegove ciljeve? <i>Does the introduction provide sufficient insight into the content of the paper and its aim?</i>	Da Yes	Ne No
Da li su materijali i metode opisane na odgovarajući način? <i>Are the materials and methods adequately described?</i>	Da Yes	Ne No
Jesu li rezultati jasno prezentirani i dobro interpretirani u diskusiji? <i>Are the results well presented and interpreted clearly in the discussion?</i>	Da Yes	Ne No
Da li naslov, podnaslovi, sažetak i popis literature odgovaraju sadržaju? <i>Do the main title, subtitles, abstract and references correspond to the content?</i>	Da Yes	Ne No
Da li je rad prikladan za objavu u časopisu Entomologia Croatica? <i>Is the manuscript suitable for publication in the journal Entomologia Croatica?</i>	Da Yes	Ne No
Jesu li autori poštivali 'Upute za autore' navedene za časopis Entomologia Croatica? <i>Did the authors follow the 'Instructions for Authors' given for the journal Entomologia Croatica?</i>	Da Yes	Ne No



Scientific Journal of Entomology
Publisher: Croatian Entomological Society,
established in 1974

With the support of:
 Department of Biology and Faculty of
 Agrobiotechnical Sciences Osijek
 Josip Juraj Strossmayer University of Osijek

Da li su potrebni jezični i gramatički ispravci? Are linguistic and grammatical corrections required?		Da Yes		Ne No	
Dodatna pojašnjenja (ako su potrebna) Additional explanations (if needed)					
KONAČNA OCJENA I PREPORUKA / FINAL DECISION AND SUGGESTION	Prihvatiti za objavu neizmjenjeno/ <i>Accept in present form</i>	Prihvatiti za objavu nakon manjih ispravaka/ <i>Accept after minor revision</i>	Prihvatiti za objavu nakon većih ispravaka/ <i>Accept after major revision</i>	Ponovno slanje u časopis/ Resubmission	Ne prihvatiti/ Reject
OBJAŠNJENJE/ EXPLANATION					
U slučaju pozitivne ocjene, molimo vas da rukopis	Izvorni znanstveni članak	Prethodno priopćenje <i>Preliminary</i>	Pregledni članak <i>Review</i>	Stručni članak <i>Professional</i>	Kratko priopćenje <i>Short</i>



Scientific Journal of Entomology
Publisher: Croatian Entomological Society,
established in 1974

With the support of:
Department of Biology and Faculty of
Agrobiotechnical Sciences Osijek
Josip Juraj Strossmayer University of Osijek

klasificirate prema zadanim kategorijama: <i>If your review is positive, please define the best fitting category of the manuscript:</i>	<i>Original scientific article</i>	<i>note</i>	<i>article</i>	<i>article</i>	<i>communication, Note</i>
Potpis Signature		Mjesto i datum Place and date			