

The scholarly journal *Miscellanea Hadriatica et Mediterranea (MHM)* published by the Department of History of the University of Zadar publishes papers in history and similar scholarly disciplines dealing with the Adriatic and Mediterranean topics, as well as reviews of works dealing with the same topics. Already published papers or papers simultaneously sent to other journals will not be accepted.

The *MHM* publishes primarily scientific papers that are subject to at least two peer-reviews, and are classified into the categories of the original scientific article, the preliminary communication and the review article. Exceptionally, professional papers will be published as well.

Review procedure and standards

Upon receiving a paper, the Editorial Board puts it in the pre-review procedure in order to see whether it complies with elementary professional, ethical and technical prerequisites; after that, it nominates at least two peer-reviewers well-versed in respective topics.

Reviews are 'double-blind', i.e. identities of both the authors and reviewers are known to the Editorial Board only. If a person invited to review a paper suspects that there is a conflict of interest (e.g. if they suspect that there is some financial, institutional, collaborative or other relationship between them and the author, or the work submitted to them for review), then they are obliged to communicate it to the Editorial Board.

Reviewers must take care of the confidentiality of the review process. All manuscripts and supporting information provided to them by the editor or author shall be considered a confidential document and may not be shown or otherwise transmitted to others without the editor's consent. Reviewers may not use unpublished materials from peer-reviewed work in their own work without the express written consent of the author.

The reviews should be thorough, objective and critical, written in good faith towards both the author and the journal. The reviewers should pay particular attention to the scientific originality of the paper and the author's treatment of previously published scholarly works: citations, references and comments must be correct, and argumentation process should be in line with modern methodological standards and procedures. The reviewer – if/when observing shortcomings – would point them out and suggest ways of improvements or changes. He/she will make their decisions and recommendations about whether the paper will be published (either as is or after making the necessary adjustments) or not, recommending to the Editorial Board the rejection of the reviewed paper.

By accepting to peer-review a paper, the reviewers have committed themselves to the above stated ethical and professional standards.

More about reviewers' responsibilities can be found in the COPE Ethical Guidelines for Peer Reviewers (<https://publicationethics.org/resources/guidelines-new/cope-ethical-guidelines-peer-reviewers>).

The filled and signed reviewer's form, with an at least 250 words long elaboration of the decision, the reviewer is to send either to casopismhm@gmail.com (or akurilic2011@gmail.com) or – if lacking the digital signature – to the following address: *Miscellanea Hadriatica et Mediterranea*, Sveučilište u Zadru, Odjel za povijest, Obala kralja Petra Krešimira IV., 2, HR - 23000 Zadar. Even then, the reviewers are kindly requested to provide the Editorial Board with the digital version of review (preferably in some of the standard word processing programs) so, in case of need, reviewers' comments could be

forwarded to authors. This is particularly important in cases when more substantial changes would be required from the authors or if the paper would be rejected.

Upon receiving and reading the reviews, the Editorial Board makes decisions regarding further editorial steps (proof-reading, translation and lay-out, or sending the paper back to the author to make necessary adjustments, sending thus adjusted papers to reviewers; or, informing the authors of their papers being rejected; etc.).

Depending on the financial circumstances of the publisher, reviewers may be rewarded with a fee.

Categorisation of papers

Scientific papers

An **original scientific paper** is a scholarly paper that includes new results based on original research, new scholarly insights and interpretations. The argumentation should be in line with the methodology proper to the historical research, and authors should provide relevant arguments, sources and other references which would enable verification of provided data, analyses and conclusions.

A **preliminary communication**, a **preliminary report**, is a paper that presents first results of an original scientific research or new scientific results that require prompt publication although the research is still ongoing or is approaching its conclusion. It is not necessary for such a paper to present all of the methodological procedures required in the original scientific paper, but it must provide the scholarly audience with the insight into the data upon which the conclusions were based upon (e.g. the figures, quantitative data and similar). This kind of papers will be published with the author's written guarantee of publishing an original scientific paper upon the conclusion of the research.

A **scientific review** is a scholarly review article that gives a comprehensive overview of a certain scientific topic or research field according to the previously published scholarly work, and can contain some original analyses, syntheses or suggestions for further scholarly research.

Professional papers

Professional papers. There can be two types of professional papers:

- 1) papers that present or describe the data from the professional standpoint, with no deeper scientific analysis and/or interpretations, and
- 2) papers that deal with particular issues immanent to particular fields, and provide with professional advices and suggestions on their solutions (techniques, technologies, methods).

In addition, in both types of professional papers it is desirable, but not obligatory, to bring a new view on issues already familiar to the professional and scholarly audience.

A **professional review** gives a comprehensive overview of a certain professional topic (techniques, technologies, methods) according to the previously published scholarly work, and points towards the best ways of solving the presented problems.

A **review** is a paper that gives a critical view on a publication or event.

The Editorial Board decides about the categories of received papers on the basis of at least two anonymous peer-reviews written by renowned authors in respective fields and topics.