

# PROSTOR

Scholarly journal of Architecture and Urban planning

## Peer Review Process of the PROSTOR: a scholarly journal of architecture and urban planning

### Editorial Standards

PROSTOR applies the recommendations given by the World Association of Medical Editors in "[Syllabus for Prospective and Newly Appointed Editors](#)".

Once a manuscript passes the initial checks, it will be assigned to at least two independent experts for peer-review. A double-blind peer-review process is applied, where authors' identities are not known to reviewers and vice versa.

### Time Limits

Generally, it is expected that the **reviewer** accepts or rejects the review not later than seven days after the invitation. The review in the 1st round is expected to be finished for 2-3 weeks and in subsequent rounds for not more than 1-2 weeks. For more extended periods, the reviewers are kindly asked to contact section editors. These limits are indicated in the invitation e-mail also. The **authors** are subduced to the same time limits and rules in their rounds of corrections.

### Editorial Decision and Revision

All the articles published in PROSTOR go through the peer-review process and receive at least two reviews. The assistant editor will communicate the decision of the editor in chief, which will be one of the following:

- Accept Submission
- Revisions Required:  
The paper is, in principle, accepted after revision based on the reviewer's comments. Authors are given 7-15 days for minor revisions.
- Resubmit for Review (reconsider after Major Revisions):  
The acceptance of the manuscript would depend on the revisions. The author needs to provide a point-by-point response or provide a rebuttal if some of the reviewer's comments cannot be revised. Usually, only one round of major revisions is allowed. Authors will be asked to resubmit the revised paper within a suitable time frame, and the revised version will be returned to the reviewer for further comments.

If additional experiments are needed to support the conclusions, the manuscript will be rejected, and the authors will be encouraged to resubmit the paper once further experiments have been conducted.

- Resubmit Elsewhere:  
The paper is not a good fit for the journal - either by a mismatch of subject areas or simply by not

being strong enough. It is an encouragement to resubmit, but you are free to submit it elsewhere instead

- **Decline Submission:**  
The article has serious flaws and/or makes no significant original contribution. No offer of resubmission to the journal is provided.

All reviewer comments should be responded to in a point-by-point fashion. Where the authors disagree with a reviewer, they must provide a clear response.

## **Ethical Codex of PROSTOR**

### **Possible researching funds**

Any source of funding for research or publication should always be disclosed. When are known organization and contract number of grants, funds, or similar information should be included.

### **Authorship and acknowledgment**

Authorship credit should be based on: substantial contributions to conception and design, or acquisition of data, or analysis and interpretation of data; drafting the article or revising it critically for important intellectual content; and final approval of the version to be published. Authors should meet all these conditions based on a definition of authorship of the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (ICMJE). Contributors who do not qualify as authors should be listed in an acknowledgment to describe the given help. **The authors' contribution sections are an obligatory part of the manuscript at the very end.**

### **Collecting authorship information**

All authors meet the appropriate authorship criteria, and that nobody who qualifies for authorship has been omitted from the list as part of their initial submission package.

### **Redundant (multiple) publications**

Journal instruction clearly explains the type of papers that are published regularly. Authors need clearly explain what is, if any, included partially or wholly in prior publications. It could be abstracts, posters, papers, books, databases, and archives (public or not). If the editor evaluates that submission is not substantially different from such previous results, it could be rejected. Journals also may accept the re-publication of materials that have been accurately translated from an original publication in a different language but only with appropriate permission(s) of all copyright holders.

### **Plagiarism**

Journal does not and will not support any possible or actual plagiarism. If authors feel that some parts could be described as plagiarism, even if are used proper quotations and citations in the text, they need to report it as part of the submission. **We use Plagscan to check mentioned similarities.**

### **Protecting research subjects and from any discrimination**

Standards of human or any life form research are beyond the journal's responsibilities. Still, all need to be stated that they are performed according to the institution's policy where they are made. According to the

law of Republic Croatia, any discrimination cannot be applied in experiments, empirical works, subjects of research, or any at possible authors, common regulative of EU and country where researching is done. If necessary, authors need submission accompanied by a statement that the relevant research ethics committee or institutional review board approved. Editors should reserve the right to reject papers if there is doubt whether appropriate procedures have been followed.

### **Errata, retractions, expressions of concern**

The Editor in Chief will decide if any post-publishing author's complaint is appropriate (editorial mistake) or not (i.e., the author's errors during post-review and pre-publishing process). If the editor finds such a complaint valid, the journal will publish corrections (errata) in the first following issue. Likewise, journals should publish 'retractions' if work is proven to be fraudulent or plagiarism or will published 'expressions of concern' if editors have well-founded suspicions of misconduct. The authors can send retraction notes for the published paper, but the Editor in Chief decides if such a statement will be accepted or not.

### **Timing of publication**

Editors will aim to ensure timely peer review and publication for papers they receive, especially where it is assumed that findings may have important implications. Authors will be noticed that such priority publication is considered in advance. Editors will tend to process the regular papers in about three months when evaluations and responses from the author(s) and editor(s) are performed in asked time.

# PROSTOR

Scholarly journal of Architecture and Urban planning

Editorial Board:

Faculty of Architecture

Kačićeva 26, 10000 Zagreb

E-mail: prostor@arhitekt.hr

## Instructions for reviewers - Guidelines for Manuscript Reviewers

PROSTOR reputation for excellence depends upon the professionalism of its reviewers. As a scholarly journal of architecture and urban planning, it invites reviewers from various disciplines to ensure that manuscripts meet high-quality standards appropriate to the scholarly disciplines the manuscripts represent. Consequently, reviewers also help determine how well manuscripts make accessible, or "translate," the sometimes technical perspectives of particular disciplines. Prostor prides itself on a developmental review process, and wherein even rejections provide authors with valuable advice. The review should be written in English.

Reviewer's report						
Title:						
Date submitted to the reviewer:						
Criteria rating *	N/A	1 (poor)	2	3	4	5 (outstanding)
Paper's topic fall within the thematic scope	●	●	●	●	●	●
Paper's title reflect its content	●	●	●	●	●	●
Importance of issues raised and likelihood of citation impact	●	●	●	●	●	●
Rigor of methodology and analysis	●	●	●	●	●	●
Adequacy of conclusion	●	●	●	●	●	●
Clarity of scientific writing, explanations, concepts and presentation	●	●	●	●	●	●
Use of standard and comprehensible professional terminology	●	●	●	●	●	●
Adequacy of literature review and theoretical context	●	●	●	●	●	●
Contribution to theory, knowledge or practise	●	●	●	●	●	●
Suitability of figures and tables (too many, too few, clarity, titles)	●	●	●	●	●	●
<i>* To meet the publication standard of the journal, articles must have a minimum rating of 3 in ever category across the range of evaluation criteria below</i>						
Recommendation						
● Accept						
● Continue review - minor revisions						

<input checked="" type="radio"/> Continue review - major revisions	
<input checked="" type="radio"/> Reject	
<b>Paper is categorized** as</b>	
<input checked="" type="radio"/> ORIGINAL SCIENTIFIC PAPER	The original scientific paper contains theoretical and practical results of the fundamental or applied research; it presents the original scientific research results for the first time; It is an integral and in-depth presentation of an entirely completed research or its completed phases which are not expected to yield some further important results; the research can be repeated and its results tested.
<input checked="" type="radio"/> PRELIMINARY COMMUNICATION	The preliminary communication is the first short article describing scientific research results which, due to their topical interest, should be published rapidly; it contains one or more new research information without an integral overview of the topic; it is primarily published in order to secure copyright in the name of the author for his partial research results; it does not provide the conditions for repeated research or testing its results.
<input checked="" type="radio"/> SCIENTIFIC SUBJECT REVIEW	The scientific subject review presents an integral overview of an area or a problem with a critical review or assessment; it is based on some earlier published results but also contains new analyses and syntheses, new relationships and/or new hypotheses for further research; the cited literature should be comprehensive enough to provide insight into the researched area; its systematicity, evaluation, commentaries, conclusions and presentations of someone else's or one's own research results give it a clear instructional purpose.
<i>** The category of the article does not necessarily determine the quality or value of the contributions, but the nature and method of processing the research conducted.</i>	
<b>Would you be willing to review a revision of this manuscript</b>	
<input checked="" type="radio"/> YES	
<input checked="" type="radio"/> NO	
<b>Confidential comments to the editor</b>	
"Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet, consectetur adipiscing elit, sed do eiusmod tempor incididunt ut labore et dolore magna aliqua. Ut enim ad minim veniam, quis nostrud exercitation ullamco laboris nisi ut aliquip ex ea commodo consequat. Duis aute irure dolor in reprehenderit in voluptate velit esse cillum dolore eu fugiat nulla pariatur. Excepteur sint occaecat cupidatat non proident, sunt in culpa qui officia deserunt mollit anim id est laborum."	
<b>Comments to the author(s)</b> <i>Please provide comments and suggestions constructive and useful for the authors to improve the scientific quality and presentation of the manuscript. If you are submitting a reviewer's report to reject the manuscript, you are asked to provide the reasons for rejection.</i>	
"Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet, consectetur adipiscing elit, sed do eiusmod tempor incididunt ut labore et dolore magna aliqua. Ut enim ad minim veniam, quis nostrud exercitation ullamco laboris nisi ut aliquip ex ea commodo consequat. Duis aute irure dolor in reprehenderit in voluptate velit esse cillum dolore eu fugiat nulla pariatur. Excepteur sint occaecat cupidatat non proident, sunt in culpa qui officia deserunt mollit anim id est laborum."	
<b>Do you want to get recognition for this review on Publons?</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> YES	
<input type="checkbox"/> NO	
Date of the review:	