

Histria

Godišnjak Istarskog povijesnog društva
The Istrian Historical Society Review
I. Matetića Ronjgova 1
HR - 52100 Pula
histria@ipd-ssi.hr, www.histria.com.hr



ISTARSKO POVIJESNO DRUŠTVO SOCIETÀ STORICA ISTRIANA

INSTRUCTIONS TO REVIEWERS (according to the Standard of Editorial Work of the Ministry of Science and Education)

The reviewer's first responsibility is to critically but constructively evaluate the article and write detailed comments and advice about the research and the article itself to help authors improve the presentation of their work. The assessment of the article includes an assessment of the originality and importance of the research, the structure of the study, the methodology, the presentation of the results, the strength of the conclusion(s) and the overall quality of the article. Another responsibility of the reviewer is to advise the editors on the suitability of the article for publication in the *Histria*.

Reviewers are obliged to inform the editors of any potential conflict of interest in relation to the authors or the content of their article submitted for review. In most of such cases, they should recuse themselves from the review. Reviewers are obliged to report possible unethical behavior of manuscript authors to the editors, especially if they notice various forms of plagiarism. Other reviewer responsibilities include treating the article as a confidential document and performing the review in a timely manner. The reviewer should not show the article to anyone without the express permission of the editors. Reviewers should be polite in their comments to the authors. The editors reserve the right to omit or withhold any remarks deemed inappropriate, when transmitting the reviewer's remarks to the authors. Reviewers may not use the data from the reviewed article for their research. Reviewers should not communicate directly with the authors or reveal their identity anywhere except in the signing of the review form, unless otherwise agreed with the editors. The editors

should give instructions to reviewers, especially those who are new to the process, about the procedure and rules of review in their journal and how to fulfill their double obligation of giving constructive remarks to authors and advising to the editors.

Reviewers are advisors to both the author and the editors. The editors can request the reviewers' opinion on the acceptability of the article for publication in the journal and should study the reviewers' advice with utmost care. The final decision regarding the publication of an article rests solely with the editors. The review should be based on a careful analysis of the article and the reviewer's good knowledge of the topic and relevant literature. The review should also point out possible shortcomings in the article, and suggestions on additions or changes that would improve the article are welcome. Articles that are categorized as *scientific* or *professional* should have two positive reviews. In case the categorizations suggested by the reviewers differ, the editors evaluate the article with the higher of the two suggestions. The reviewers suggest the category of the article according to the instructions of the Ministry of Science and Education.

1. An *original scientific paper* contains hitherto unpublished results of original research that are presented so that their accuracy can be verified, as well as the accuracy of the analysis and conclusions on which they are based.

2. A *preliminary communication* contains one or more pieces of new scientific data, but without sufficient details that would allow verification as in the case of original scientific articles. The results of ongoing scientific research can be given, the results of which, due to their topicality, require quick publication on the assumption that a complete paper will be published later.

3. A *review article* contains a complete description of the state and development tendencies of a certain area with a critical review and assessment. The included literature must be complete enough so that it provides a firm insight and thorough overview of the current trends in the topic.

4. A *professional paper* contains useful contributions from and for the profession but does not have to represent original research.