



SYNTHESIS PHILOSOPHICA

Filozofski fakultet, I. Lučića 3, HR-10000 Zagreb - Tel. + 385(0)1-6111-808, Fax +385(0)1-6117-012 - e-mail: synthesis.philosophica@hrfd.hr - www.hrfd.hr

GUIDELINES FOR REVIEWERS

General information

Synthesis philosophica publishes only thus far unpublished papers in English, German and French language.

Scientific review is a critical evaluation of proposed scientific content for publishing, used by the Editors' office to decide whether the proposed paper will be published or rejected. The purpose of the reviewing process is to gain insight into the credibility of the submitted paper and provide legitimacy for publishing it in the academic community. Both the reviewers and the Editor's office participate in the evaluation. The Editor's office has the final word on publishing the paper and designating the category under which the paper will be published.

The Editor's office of *Synthesis philosophica* applies the double-blind peer-review procedure. The process involves sending an anonymised version of the received manuscript to at least two international experts on the topic of the proposed manuscript. Both the authors of the manuscript and the reviewers are unaware of the identity of any side participating in the review process. After receiving the evaluations, if the Editor's office is unsure regarding the final decision, it will seek for an additional expert's opinion.

Being an open science journal, *Synthesis philosophica* grounds its scientific communication on the quality of scientists and their good will and integrity. The journal does not pay for the reviewing process and the Editor's office will refuse any attempt to privatise the process for preferred results.

After receiving the evaluations, depending on their content the Editor's office can reject a proposed manuscript, accept it or accept it conditionally and request a revision. After a revision, the Editor's office can choose to return the manuscript to the reviewers for an additional evaluation, or seek additional opinion. The process may repeat itself until the Editor's office issues a final verdict.

Reviewer's responsibilities

We kindly ask reviewers to provide all information requested by the reviewer's form, including the categorisation the propose for the evaluated manuscript, and to approach the accepted manuscripts objectively and thoroughly. We recommend writing a detailed evaluation spanning

from two to eight typewritten pages (1800 keystrokes with spaces per typewritten page), listing reasons for publishing or rejecting the paper, and explicitly stating whether the manuscript should be published or not, and under what category.

While writing the analysis of the manuscript, we kindly ask of reviewers to:

- Highlight and explain the structure and content of the manuscript.
- Critically evaluate the logical structure and validity of the applied methodology and the presentation of its results, author's argumentation, and the plausibility of explicated hypotheses.
- Critically grade the acceptability of the use of language and style.
- Critically evaluate the authentic author's contribution to the researched topic in respect to the sources used.
- In the case of the suspecting plagiarism, notify the Editor's office.

Based on the analysis, the reviewer will suggest a possible category:

1. **Original (scientific) paper:** a manuscript presents new and thus far unpublished results of scientific research.
2. **Preliminary communication:** a manuscript presents new and thus far unpublished preliminary results of scientific research.
3. **Review paper:** a manuscript presents an original and critical survey of a specific field of study or its part.
4. **Do not publish:** a manuscript should be rejected because it contains serious flaws or its content was plagiarised. In the case of suggesting rejection, please provide additional explanation for the reasons why.

Granted, the reviewer may suggest the categorisation conditionally, requesting a revision. In the case of revision, we kindly ask reviewers to be as precise as possible in providing instructions for a revision. After a revision, the manuscript could be returned to the reviewer for an additional evaluation, especially if a reviewer explicitly requests to examine the revised manuscript

Consent for processing personal data

Under Art. 7. para. 1 and Art. 8. para 2. of the Personal Data Protection Act (Official Gazette No. 103/03, 118/06, 41/08, 130/11, 106/12 – consolidated text), Croatian Philosophical Society requests consent for (1) processing personal data for submission, processing and publishing papers in journal *Synthesis philosophica*, (2) carrying out the review process, (3) and archiving material. Information regarding the necessity of this act is available in the document titled General Data Protection Regulation (Regulation (EU) 2016/679 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 27 April 2016 on the protection of natural persons with regard to the processing of personal data and on the free movement of such data, and repealing Directive 95/46/EC), available here: <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/reg/2016/679/oj>.



By accepting to do the review, the reviewer of the manuscript (1) confirms that they understand the General Data Protection Regulation act, (2) confirms that the Editor's office properly ensured that they (the author) are familiar with their rights in respect to the General Data Protection Regulation act, and (3) is granting consent to the Croatian Philosophical Society Zagreb for (3.1) processing personal data for the purpose of submission, processing and publishing papers in journal *Synthesis philosophica*, (3.2) carrying out the review process, and (3.3) archiving material. The personal data includes full name and surname, institution or home address, e-mail address and other miscellaneous data provided through manuscript submission.

Confirmation letter

The Editor's office can issue a confirmation letter stating that a reviewer participated in the reviewing process for the journal *Synthesis philosophica* of the Croatian Philosophical Society.

Editor's office
Synthesis philosophica