Dear reviewers,

to enable uniformity of reviews in *Annales Instituti Archaeologici* (<https://hrcak.srce.hr/en/aia>) we are enclosing instructions for reviewers (according to the [Standard](https://mzo.gov.hr/UserDocsImages/dokumenti/Znanost/ZnanstvenaInfrastruktura/Upute%20za%20ure%C4%91ivanje%20i%20oblikovanje%20%C4%8Dasopisa.pdf) of Ministry of Science and Education of Republic of Croatia).

The first responsibility of reviewers is to critically but constructively assess the article and write detailed comments and advice on the research and the very paper to help authors improve the presentation of their work. Assessment of the paper includes an assessment of originality and the importance of research, organization of the paper, methodology, presentation of the results, force of conclusion and the overall quality of paper. Reviewers are required to inform the editor about any potential conflict of interest in relation to authors or the content of their paper that they were asked to review. In most such cases they should be excused from reviewing the paper. Other responsibilities of reviewers include the handling of paper as confidential file and completing the reviews on time. The reviewer should not show paper to anyone without the express permission of the editor. Reviewers should be respectable in their comments of the paper addressed to the author. In the case of inappropriate comments, editors may reject to convey such comments to the authors or even not show all reviewer comments to the authors. Reviewers are not allowed to use research data described in a paper that they received for review for their own research. Reviewers should not communicate directly with authors or reveal themselves to authors, except with their signature under remarks as part of a review or as otherwise agreed with the editor.

Review should be based on a careful analysis of the paper and the reviewer should be well informed about the subject and relevant bibliography. The review should also point out any deficiencies in the text of the paper. The suggestions about updates or changes contributing to a higher valorisation of the article are desirable. Reviewers suggest category of the paper:

1. **Preliminary communication** is an article that contains one or more new scientific data but without sufficient detail to enable verification as in original research papers. In preliminary communication results of scientific research in progress can be given, which due to current interest require immediate publication, assuming latter publication of the complete work.

2. **Short communication, Note** is an article that contains the unpublished results of a short but completed scientific research, or represents a shorter segment of ongoing research if that segment can be treated as a complete unit, or describes an original method.

3. **Review article** is an article that contains a comprehensive overview of the status and trends of development in specific areas with a critical review and assessment. Cited references must be sufficiently complete to enable a good insight into the presented area.

4. **Professional paper** is an article that may contain display of original solutions, display of significant practical exercises, informing and contributing to the spread of knowledge etc.

Best regards,

Editorial board of *AIA*