

## **INSTRUCTIONS FOR REVIEWERS**

- Subject to peer review are the papers which can be classified into four categories according to general standards:
  - *Original scientific paper* (Contains previously unpublished results of the scientific research. The paper must contain all the details necessary for reproducibility of the work described.)
  - *Preliminary communication* (Contains previously unpublished preliminary results of scientific research which should preferably be published soon)
  - *Review paper* (A concise and critical overview of the specific research area with recent information on the current state of development and direction)
  - *Professional paper* (A concise and critical overview of the chosen topic with directions and controversies. It must be understandable even to non-specialists in that field. It differs from the scientific one primarily because it does not present the original results of the research author but uses already published results, systemizes and explains them)
- Each paper that is subject to peer-review process goes through two peer reviews.
- Reviewers suggest the category, and final decision is made by the Editorial Board. Uncategorized papers (reviews, commentaries, etc.) are not the subject to peer-review process, the Editorial Board accepts them on the basis of their own insights.
- The reviewer is responsible to critically assess the quality of the paper received for evaluation. It is his duty to provide detailed observations and advice on the research and formulation of the results in order to help the author/s to improve their work. The evaluation of the paper includes an assessment of its originality and significance, its methodological structure and validity of conclusions drawn from the results obtained.
- The reviewers are obliged to warn the Editorial Board about possible difficulties which could prevent them from being objective in the peer-review process. They are also obliged to treat the paper received as a confidential document, i. e. not to show the paper to anybody else without the consent of the Editorial Board, not to use for their own research the results of the paper, submitted to them for peer review, before publication of the paper.
- The reviewer is obliged to complete the review on time and to keep the academic level of communication when writing the review.
- After reading the paper, the reviewer is obliged to give his opinion whether the paper should be published, to suggest a categorization if the review is positive and to express

their opinion on whether anything in the paper should be corrected or improved.

Assessment should be within the following guidelines:

- YES – (“Accepted”) Unconditional approval to publish the paper.
- YES, PROVIDED THAT – (“Accepted with improvement”) Approval requires certain modifications/improvements which have to be done in the paper
- NO, UNLESS – (“Not accepted”) It is necessary to make a thorough revision and reconstruction of the paper.
- NO – (“Not accepted”) There is not even a minimum of elements that can be used.
- Reviews are double-blind i.e. the reviewer will not know the name of the author and vice versa.
- At the end of each volume, a list of the reviewers of all papers for that volume is published, including those that were published as well as those that were rejected.

## PEER-REVIEW FORM

*Hum – journal of Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Mostar*

- REVIEWER:
- PLACE AND DATE:
- NAME OF THE PAPER:
  
- NUMBER OF PAGES:
- PAPER IS: ORIGINAL SCIENTIFIC PAPER  
PRELIMINARY COMMUNICATION  
REVIEW PAPER  
PROFESSIONAL PAPER

### Reviewer's observations

- (DEFINING THE PROBLEM, GENESIS OF THE PROBLEM, USING ADEQUATE REFERENCES, OBSERVING AND DEFINING DATA, DESCRIPTION OF THE RESEARCH, CONCLUSION)

---

#### • Do you suggest that the paper be published?

- a) YES – (“Accepted”) Unconditional approval to publish the paper.
- b) YES, PROVIDED THAT – (“Accepted with improvement”) Approval requires certain modifications/improvements which have to be done in the paper
- c) NO, UNLESS – (“Not accepted”) It is necessary to make a thorough revision and reconstruction of the paper.
- d) NO – (“Not accepted”) There is not even a minimum of elements that can be used.

REVIEWER'S SIGNATURE

---