

CROATIAN SOCIETY FOR RHEUMATOLOGY
Croatian Medical Association
Šubićeva 9, 10000 ZAGREB

JOURNAL

Reumatizam

Vinogradska c. 29, 10000 Zagreb
Sestre milosrdnice University Hospital Center

Editor-in-Chief: Simeon Grazio
Editor: Nadica Laktašić Žerjavić
Secretary: Hana Skala Kavanagh
<http://www.reumatizam.hlz.hr>



Guidelines for reviewers

(according to the *Committee on Publication Ethics* ((COPE) guidelines; <https://publicationethics.org>)

Contribution to editorial decision

Peer review helps editors make editorial decisions and, through editorial communication, help authors improve their manuscripts. Peer review is an essential part of formal scientific communication and the center of scientific endeavors. Every scientist who wants to contribute to the scientific process is obligated to peer review manuscripts and to do so in an unbiased manner.

Reviewer's job is delicate and carries a lot of responsibility. Reviews often serve as the basis for editorial decisions and determine the fate of manuscripts. Reviewers' suggestions and evaluations improve the quality of a journal. The Editorial Board of *Reumatizam* decided that the peer review is double-blind.

Timeliness

A reviewer who does not feel qualified to review a manuscript or who is unable to provide the review within the expected time frame should immediately inform the publisher and decline the invitation to review the manuscript, so that other reviewers may be contacted.

If a reviewer accepts the invitation to review a manuscript, the editorial office would appreciate the review to be submitted within two (2) weeks from the date indicated on the reviewer's form.

Confidentiality

Any manuscript received for review is a confidential document and should be treated as such: it should not be shown to or discussed with other individuals unless the editor-in-chief permits it (possible in exceptional and specific situations). This also applies to reviewers who declined the invitation to review a manuscript.

According to the Editorial Board of *Reumatizam*, the peer review is double-blind.

Objectivity standards

Reviews should be objective. Observations should be formulated clearly and supported by arguments, to help the author make corrections to the manuscript. Personal criticism of the author is inappropriate.

Please keep in mind that many manuscripts are submitted by young authors who often send their first manuscript for consideration for publication to *Reumatizam*. If their work is inadequate in respect of the form, but contains valuable observations and information, these authors should be helped by constructive feedback.

Reviewers are expected to answer the questions listed in the reviewer's form and to determine whether the author complied with the instructions for authors, which are published in every issue of *Reumatizam* and available online at the journal's website. Also, a reviewer should check whether the statements and thoughts presented in the manuscript are plausible, evaluate the methodology and references, and inform the Editorial Office of any possible omissions, especially in conclusions.

A reviewer should not engage in linguistic corrections, but may leave a related comment. We would appreciate it if a reviewer paid special attention to the following: that the manuscript title is clear, concise, and corresponds to the content of the manuscript; that the abstract provides the essential results of the work; that the author cites the recent literature and mentions domestic authors who have published on the same topic in local journals or *Reumatizam*; if the author omitted to mention other authors who disagree with his or her opinions; if the author present other author's thoughts without the citation, and that the literature data are accurate and complete. The listed references should be checked. Also, the reviewer should assess if the figures, tables, and graphs are informative and essential, check that the tables do not repeat the results presented in the text and that all additional material is appropriate for reproduction. Tables should be checked for unexplained or unclear abbreviations and for accuracy of numerical data, which should correspond to those presented in the text.

If the reviewer thinks that a manuscript deserves a review or that the manuscript may be improved by reviewer's contribution (literature data or own experience), the reviewer may agree with the editor to publish the review in the same issue as the manuscript.

Published sources

Reviewers should identify the relevant published work that was not cited by the authors. Every statement that is a comment, performance or argument that has already been published should be accompanied by a relevant citation. Reviewers should inform the editor-in-chief about a potential similarity or overlap between the manuscript under review and another manuscript (published or not) known to them.

Conflict-of-interest statement

An invited reviewer who has conflict of interest due to competitive, collaborative, or other type of relationship or relation with any of the authors, companies or institutions associated with the manuscript and the work described in the manuscript should immediately inform the editor and decline the invitation to review the manuscript, so that other reviewers may be contacted.

Unpublished material included in the manuscript under review should not be used by the reviewer in his or her research without the written consent from the author. Privileged information or ideas obtained through a peer review must remain confidential and must not be used for reviewer's private advantage.

The same applies to the reviewers who decline the invitation to review.

Reviewers are encouraged to register at Publons, an internet portal and free-of-charge service, for tracking, verification and presentation of their reviews and their editorial contributions to academic journals (<https://publons.com>).

REVIEWS ARE FREE-OF-CHARGE.

THANK YOU FOR ALL YOUR EFFORTS!

Editorial Board