**Zbornik Pravnog fakulteta u Zagrebu**

**Peer review policy**

Following the submission of an article, it is first considered by an editor concerning the fulfilment of formal requirements and the suitability of the researched topic with regard to the scope of the journal. If the topic of the article does not correspond to the scope of the journal or it is deemed that the quality of research does not fulfil the standards of Zbornik, the submission will be outright rejected. If the submitted article is considered to satisfy the requirements for being taken into further procedure, it will be first checked by PlagScan application and the editors shall take necessary precautions to ensure that the ethical principles are upheld during all the process, and concerning all the included parties.

If the submission has passed the initial check-up by the editors, it will be sent to the two reviewers along with the appropriate review form, preserving the confidentiality of information and the anonymity of authors and reviewers, in line with the review process being based on two double-blind peer reviews. The reviewers are chosen among the distinguished international and domestic scholars (scientists) after consultations within the editorial board. In the process of choosing the reviewers, the editors will take care to observe all ethical principles.

The reviewers, by accepting to review the article, commit themselves to prepare the review in prescribed time and to uphold all scientific and ethical principles. In the review form, there are given the main issues, questions, which the reviewers should answer and comment upon. There is also additional space for general comments, while the reviewers can write comments and suggestions, as well point to needed corrections, in the submitted document of the article. Upon return, this document is checked and anonymized so there is no possibility to ascertain the identity of a reviewer. In case of a too short or insufficiently explicated review, the editors can ask for its amendment and extension. Otherwise, the review can be rejected.

The reviewer can recommend the paper to be accepted for publication, with the suggestion for its categorisation, mark that the article could be published only after corrections, which are explained in the review form, or suggest that the article is not suitable for publishing. In case of one negative review (the article is not suitable for publishing), the article is sent for a third review, while in the case of two negative reviews, it is rejected.

If both reviews are positive, the paper is accepted for publication and the submitted articles are categorised as follows:

(1) Original scientific paper – the paper which is characterised by originality of conclusions, or which presents previously unpublished original results of scientific research;

(2) Review article - the article that contains detailed and comprehensive critical review of a certain problem area, but with no significant originality of results;

(3) Preliminary communication – the paper which presents primary findings of research in progress, which due to current interest require immediate publication, but without the level of deep and thorough study required for the scientific paper, and

(4) Professional paper – the paper which contains information and experience relevant for a certain profession, but without scientific characteristics.