

Before accepting a review commitment, a reviewer must consider whether the manuscript is within their area of scientific expertise and check for any conflicts of interest. The reviewer may not be the mentor of the author, a member on the same project as the author or in any way affiliated with the writing of the manuscript under review. If the reviewer conceals the existence of any conflict of interest, a mentorship relationship with the author or a similar association, the Editorial Board will reject the review and select a different reviewer.

By accepting a review, the reviewer affirms that there is no conflict of interest.

The *Social Psychiatry* journal only publishes previously unpublished manuscripts. During the course of the review, if the reviewer discovers that the manuscript or significant parts of it have already been published elsewhere, the reviewer must immediately inform the journal's Editorial Board.

#### Review structure guideline

##### 1. Scope and structure of the manuscript

The reviewer should briefly describe the contents of the manuscript in a clear and concise manner. The logical structure and completeness of the contents of the manuscript should also be addressed.

##### 2. General remarks

The reviewer should evaluate the soundness of the methodology and the theoretical-conceptual background of the manuscript. The basis and strength of the argumentation in the manuscript should also be addressed, noting the both the strengths and weak points in the arguments.

The review should answer the following questions:

- a) Does the title of the manuscript match its contents?
- b) Should any parts of the manuscript be expanded or removed?
- c) Does the author use a style and vocabulary that is appropriate for the readership of the journal?
- d) Is the abstract representative of the contents of the manuscript?

##### 2. Special remarks

In addition to general remarks, the reviewer may also offer specific remarks that address particular issues in the manuscript, especially with regard to possible errors.

##### 3. Evaluation of the manuscript and conclusion

When assessing the quality of the manuscript, the reviewer should evaluate its originality and scientific contribution to understanding the topic it addresses as well as its relevance for the field. The following are some suggested elements to consider in evaluating the manuscript, especially regarding original scientific papers:

- a) Has the author selected the manuscript topic appropriately, i.e. without being excessive in scope and by focusing on specific aspects that provide insight into potential new discoveries?
- b) Does the author consider the literature relevant to the topic under discussion, including articles published in Croatian?
- c) In addition to citing the literature, does the author express their own opinions, thoughts, criticisms, insights and conclusions?

d) A positive evaluation is also appropriate for manuscripts that present a previously addressed topic in a way that is novel in or specific for Croatia, or for manuscripts which provide a review of important literature and present and discuss a topic which is not unknown in the wider scientific community but has not been sufficiently addressed in Croatia.

#### 4. Publication recommendations

Finally, the reviewer should recommend publication, revision or rejection for the manuscript according to the following ranking:

- a) The manuscript may be published without further revisions.
- b) The manuscript may be published after revisions suggested in the review.
- c) The manuscript should undergo a second review after revisions suggested in the review.
- d) Publication of the manuscript in a different journal should be recommended.
- e) The manuscript is not suitable for publication.

The recommended timeframe for the review is two weeks.

The length of the text and the scope of the comments and criticism in the review are at the reviewer's discretion. Reviewers may also supply an annotated version of the original text, which may be presented to the authors. The review process is double-blinded – i.e. the identity of the author remains anonymous until publication and the identity of the reviewer of a particular manuscript is revealed only upon the reviewer's own request.

Articles are categorized as follows (the final decision is made by the Editorial Board at the reviewer's recommendation):

- 1) Original scientific paper: a manuscript that, based on the evaluation of the reviewers and the Editorial Board, contains previously unpublished original theoretical or experimental results obtained from original research.
- 2) Preliminary communication: contains one or more novel scientific discoveries or pieces of data, but without enough details to allow replication and assessment as in an original scientific paper.
- 3) Review: an original, concise, critical examination of the state-of-the-art, developments and trends in a field or topic of research that includes a critical evaluation and examination.
- 4) Professional paper: a text that introduces or provides information on a field of professional expertise or presents original solutions within it.