



Instructions for Reviewers

General information for Reviewers:

The peer review process is vital to the strength of a journal, evaluating the quality, validity, and relevance of published articles. The primary purpose of the reviewers' reports is to provide the editor with the information needed to reach a decision about accepting or rejecting the manuscript for publication, but it should also instruct the authors on how to strengthen their manuscript if revision is a possibility.

Manuscripts submitted for Veterinarski arhiv and retained for review are sent to two or three reviewers, chosen by the members of the Editorial Board. After accepting the invitation to review the manuscript, all received materials must be treated as confidential documents. This means that they may not be shared with anyone else without prior authorization from the editor.

It is important that the manuscripts are critically evaluated for compliance with the following criteria: novelty, importance to the specific field, and strong evidence for the conclusions drawn.

Based on the opinion of the reviewers, the editor decides to: accept the manuscript with or without minor revisions; invite the authors to revise the manuscript before a final decision is reached; or reject the manuscript for lack of novelty, insufficient conceptual advance or major technical and/or interpretational problems.

If the Editorial Office, after receiving the revised version from the authors, feels that a second opinion by the reviewer is needed, the revised manuscript may be sent to the same reviewer for re-evaluation. The procedure, through the COMET system for re-evaluation, is the same as for the first evaluation.

Reviewers' recommendations are gratefully received by the editor, however, since editorial decisions are based on evaluations derived from several sources, reviewers should not expect the editor to consider every recommendation.

Responsibility of the Peer Reviewer:

Peer reviewer is responsible for critically reading and evaluating a manuscript and providing respectful, constructive, and honest feedback to authors and editor about the submission. Peer reviewer discusses the strengths and weaknesses of the article, ways to improve the strength and quality of the work, and evaluates the relevance and originality of the manuscript.

Before Reviewing:

Reviewers should consider:

- If the article matches their expertise. If this is not the case, please notify the editor as soon as possible. We will appreciate it if you recommend an alternate reviewer.
- If there are any potential conflicts of interest; while conflicts of interest do not disqualify a reviewer, it is important to disclose all conflicts of interest to the editors before reviewing. If you have any questions about potential conflicts of interest, please contact the editor.
- We expect a review to be completed within three weeks. If you do not think you can complete the review within this time frame, please let the editor know, and, if possible, suggest an alternate reviewer.

Review:

When reviewing the article, reviewers should familiarize themselves with Instruction for Authors and consider:

- **Scope:** Is the article in line with the aims and scope of the journal?
- **Content Quality and Originality:** Is the article sufficiently novel and interesting to warrant publication? Does it add to the canon of knowledge? Does the article adhere to the journal's standards?
- **Organization and Clarity:**
 - Title: Does it clearly describe the article?
 - Abstract: Does it reflect the content of the article?
 - Introduction: Does it summarize relevant research to provide context for the article?
 - Materials and Methods: Does the author accurately explain how the data was collected? Is the design suitable for answering the question posed? Is there sufficient information present for you to replicate the research? Does the article identify the procedures followed? Are these ordered in a meaningful way? If the methods are new, are they explained in detail? Was the sampling appropriate? Have the equipment and materials been adequately described? Does the article make it clear what type of data was recorded; has the author been precise in describing measurements?
 - Results: It should be laid out and in a logical sequence. You will need to consider if the appropriate analysis has been conducted. Are the statistics correct? If you

are not comfortable with statistics, please advise the editor when you submit your report.

- Conclusion/Discussion: Are the results interpreted in the light of published research? Have the authors indicated how the results relate to expectations and earlier research? Does the article support or contradict previous theories? Does the conclusion explain how the research has moved the body of scientific knowledge forward?
- Tables, Figures, Images: Are they appropriate? Do they properly show the data? Are they easy to interpret and understand?
- Click on one of the links received in the invitation e-mail either to accept the review, decline the review or download the manuscript through the Journal's online submission system (COMET).
- Login to the Journal's Comet system with the username and password provided in the invitation e-mail, check your details (especially contact details and field of expertise), and correct or add to them if needed. Fill in the reviewer's form and write your comments before sending the comments **remove your name** from the part intended for the authors.
- If you wish to write the comments directly into the downloaded text of the manuscript, check the settings on your computer (under Properties) to see whether your name will appear next to the comments.
- When uploading your review, check the category (type) of submission that the authors have proposed, and click whether you agree with it or choose another, more suitable category (e.g. if the authors wish to publish their paper as an original scientific paper, but you think that it does not contain enough results for a complete research paper or that the results are too preliminary, choose the category "scientific note" or "preliminary communication").
- For any inquiries or in the case of technical problems, contact the Editorial Office.

Final Comments:

- All submissions are confidential and please do not discuss any aspect of the submissions with a third party.
- Please do not contact the author directly.
- Ethical Issues (refer also to For Authors – Transparency Policy and a Cover Letter):
 - Plagiarism: If you suspect that an article is a substantial copy of another work, please let the editor know, citing the previous work in as much detail as possible
 - Fraud: It is very difficult to detect the determined fraudster, but if you suspect the results in an article to be untrue, discuss it with the editor
- Other ethical concerns: For medical research, has confidentiality been maintained? Has there been a violation of the accepted norms in the ethical treatment of animal or human subjects? If so, then these should also be identified to the editor.

Submit a review:

Summarize the article in a short paragraph. Write a brief conclusion about whether the manuscript is suitable for publishing in *Veterinarski arhiv* and whether it has been written according to the Instructions for Authors.

Provide your main impressions of the article, including whether it is novel and interesting, whether it has sufficient impact and adds to the knowledge base.

Provide specific comments and suggestions, including regarding the layout and format, Title, Abstract, Introduction, Method and methods (statistical errors), Results, Discussion, Conclusions, the language and References.

Provide your recommendation. When you make a recommendation, it is worth considering the categories the editor most likely uses for classifying the article: Reject (explain reasons in your report), accept without revision, revision – either major or minor (explain the revision that is required, and indicate to the editor whether or not you would be happy to review the revised article).