

INSTRUCTIONS TO REVIEWERS

Only original, unpublished articles are published in the Collected papers of Šibenik College.

General information

A review is a critical assessment and evaluation of the content based on which the Editorial Board decides on the publication or non-publication of a proposed author's article. The purpose of the review process is to determine the scientific quality of the article and create legitimacy for publication to the academic community. Reviewers and the Editorial Board of the Journal participate in the final assessment of the scientific quality of the article and the legitimacy for publication. The Editorial Board has the final say on the publication decision.

The journal's editorial board conducts a double-blind review process. The review process involves sending the author's anonymized manuscript to an expert on the topic of the proposed manuscript, where the author of the manuscript does not know the identity of the reviewer before, during, and after the review process. If based on the reviews received / the editorial board cannot make an unambiguous decision on the publication of the manuscript, an additional opinion of the new reviewer is required.

After the Editorial Board finds the reviewers, it sends an information form with the title of the manuscript, a summary of the manuscript, keywords of the manuscript, and a list of sources used in the research. When the reviewer accepts the review of the manuscript, the editorial board sends the original, anonymized manuscripts and the review form and sets a deadline for writing reviews.

After the reviewer fills out the form and makes suggestions, regardless of their content, the Editorial Board may reject the manuscript, accept the manuscript, or conditionally accept the manuscript. A conditionally accepted manuscript means returning the manuscript to the author for revision. After finishing, the editors of the revised manuscript return the review for a new evaluation. The process can be repeated until reviewers or Editorial Board determine the final decision to publish the manuscript.

Responsibilities of reviewers

Reviewers are asked to fill in all fields on the review form, including selecting the categorization they deem desirable, and to approach the content objectively and thoroughly when reading the manuscript. Reviewers are encouraged to write an explanation of the decision and analysis of the article on two to four text cards in which they must state the reasons for publishing or not publishing the article and explicitly suggest that the article not be published or published under a certain category.

When writing a manuscript analysis, we ask reviewers to strive to:

- Highlight and explain the structure and content of the manuscript
- Critically evaluate the logical structure, the validity of the applied methodology and the presentation of its results, the argumentative content of the manuscript, and the viability of the presented hypotheses
- Critically evaluate the adequacy of linguistic expression and stylistic transmission of opinions
- Critically evaluate the author's authentic contribution to the research topic concerning the sources one uses.
- In case of doubt in the authenticity of the article, inform the Editorial Board before the decision on publication.

Based on the analysis, the reviewer will evaluate one of the four possible categorizations of the article:

1. Original article: contains new, as yet unpublished results of scientific research, fully elaborated and presented in an objectively verifiable way, with mostly or completely original contribution of the author.
2. Preliminary communication: contains new, as yet unpublished results of scientific research, presented in a predominantly objectively verifiable manner, but incompletely elaborated or presented in a preliminary form as part of a project or wider research.
3. Review article: contains an original, as yet unpublished critical review of a certain area or some part of it in which the author actively participates. The role of the author's original contribution in this area concerning already published works must be emphasized, as well as a review of these works.
4. Professional article: contains knowledge and experience relevant to a particular profession, but has no scientific characteristics.
5. Do not publish: eliminative categorization will let editors know that there are serious reasons to avoid publishing the proposed manuscript. If reviewers suggest not publishing the article, please provide a more detailed explanation of the reasons for not publishing.

In addition, the reviewer may indicate the categorization conditionally - if the author meets the requirements of the reviewer. Reviewers may consider that the manuscript may be published, but that it requires substantive refinement. In this case, the editors invite reviewers to provide the author with instructions and guidelines in the review, based on which the author can upgrade the article to the required level. After refinement, the article may be returned for re-examination to the reviewer, especially if the reviewer expressly requests it. If the reviewer explicitly points out, certain parts or the entire review may not be shown to the author.

Upon completion of the review process, especially in the case of rejection of the manuscript, the Editorial Board has a rule, but not an obligation, to show anonymized review results. The editors will usually do this when they consider that the content of the review evaluation will help the author in refining the research.

Certificate of participation in the review process

According to the needs of the reviewer, upon receiving the reviewed manuscript, the Editorial Board may issue a certificate to the author for participation in the review process.