

The Peer Review

The paper is accepted for publication by the decision of the Editorial Board after checking the authenticity of the content using the tool Turnitin, assessing whether the topic corresponds to the concept of the journal and the review process based on two anonymous positive external reviews and in accordance with the Regulations on the publishing activities of the University of Osijek and University of Zadar and according to the instructions of the COPE Ethical Guidelines for Peer Reviewers, taking into account the standards of objectivity, anonymity and confidentiality of data. The categorization of papers is carried out according to the valid Instructions for editing and formatting the journals of the Ministry of Science and Education of the Republic of Croatia.

By accepting the review assignment, the reviewer acknowledges that there is no conflict of interest between the review and other professional or personal roles. The selection of reviewers is based on their expertise in the field of manuscript topics. The final selection of reviewers is decided by the Editorial Board.

The Editorial board makes the final decision on accepting/not accepting the paper based on reviews. The condition for accepting manuscripts for publication is two positive reviews. In some cases, if one of the reviews is positive and the other negative, the Editorial Board might seek for the opinion of a third reviewer.

The Editorial Board also makes the final decision on the categorization of the article based on the reviewers' suggestions.

Except for e-mail communication with reviewers (submission of the manuscript and the review form, applying the standards of confidentiality and protection of personal data), the Editorial Board is not involved in the process of reviewing the manuscript.

Instructions to reviewers

Before accepting a review assignment, consider whether the article is within your areas of scientific work and check for conflicts of interest. By accepting the review, the reviewer confirms that there is no conflict of interest between the review and the other professional or personal roles. If selected reviewers are unable to evaluate the paper or they feel they are not qualified to review a manuscript, they are obliged to inform the editor-in-chief as soon as possible. After that, members of the Editorial board suggest another reviewer.

Reviewers enter their evaluation of the manuscript and suggest its categorization in the received review form. Peer review should be objective and scientifically based. Reviewers critically and constructively evaluate the received manuscript and make their own clear and constructive views, suggestions, and comments. Reviewers are obliged to warn about relevant published works that authors failed to cite and to draw the attention of the editor-in-chief to possible cases of plagiarism, copyright infringement, or other unacceptable actions.

Guidelines for Article Categorization

Original Scientific Paper

An article whose scientific contribution may be of a research and/or of a theoretical nature. The first contains unpublished results of original scientific research in its entirety or includes methodological, analytical and interpretive level of the text and scientific argumentation and credibility. The second contains systematic critical reviews and meta-analyzes whose the

originality of contribution is determined by the focus, coverage and argumentation of the discussion in relation to appropriate contemporary theoretical contributions.

Preliminary report

A scientific paper that contains unpublished preliminary results of a scientific research that is ongoing or a problem set only theoretically without a complete elaboration.

Review paper

A paper that contains a concise overview of the state and tendencies of development of a scientific field, theoretical problems or research topics.

Professional paper

Paper that contains useful contributions from the profession and for the profession, and does not have to represent original research.