

Instructions to Reviewers

*Anonymity of the Review Process*

Being a scientific journal, *Obnovljeni život* choses research papers by means of the review process. The identity of neither author nor reviewer of the paper are revealed during the process. While the identity of the former is disclosed after publication of the paper, the identity of the latter remains anonymous even after publication. Furthermore, the written review is preserved in the archives of the journal's editorial office and may be submitted to the Publishing Committee at the Ministry of Science, Education and Sports for their evaluation of the journal, or rather of the quality of the review process and of the reviews themselves.

Due to the anoymous nature of the review process the reviewer himself must treat the research paper as a confidential document. He should not: disclose his identity to the author of the article, nor discuss the paper with him directly; submit the paper to a third party without the express permission of the editor nor utilize the data in the paper for his review.

*The Importance, Expertise and Responsibility of the Reviewer*

The editor seeks out a quality and reliable expert in the field treated in the author's paper and dispatches the essay in question along with the review form on paper or electronically. The reviewer must fill out the review form and write the review. Within the specified time limit, approximately two weeks after receiving the review request, he is to deliver both the review and the form on paper, dated and signed and if electronically dispatched, leastwise the review. The review should be brief (one standard page, i.e. 1800 characters with spaces), clear and well-structured.

The reviewer is the most important link in the review process. He is an advisor to both the author of the essay and the editor (editorial office) of the journal. He helps the former to improve his presentation and the latter (editorial office) to make a decision regarding the appropriateness of the article for publication. It is for this reason that he is obliged to inform the editor as to his expertise on the subject treated in the paper submitted to him for review, that is, about his own potential conflict of interest with regard to the author and to the content of the said article.

Correctness, politeness, respect and constructiveness must always accompany comments and advice addressed to the author of the essay or to the editor (editorial office). In his critical assessment of the author's work, the reviewer's comments must be argumented, and recommendations for improvement of the article must be clear. Constructive and substantiated criticism must support the reviewer's expert advice to the editor (editorial office) of the journal regarding the appropriateness of the article to be published or, on the other hand, its rejection. Along with the said advice, the reviewer should also reply to the obligatory review process questions and suggest how to categorize the author's work. The reviewer would do well to allow himself to be guided by the questions, recommendations, categorizations and guidelines of the editorial office cited below.

*Questions, Recommendations, Categorization and Guidelines*

*Mandatory review questions*

a)  Does the content of the research paper befit the profile of a scientific journal?

b)  Does the title of the paper correspond to its content?

c)  Do the summary and key words correspond to the content?

d)  Does the essay require either supplementary information or abridgement?

e)  Is the author's language understandable to readers of the journal?

f)  Are quotes and references accurate?

*Recommendations for publication*

a)  the paper can be published

b)  the paper can be published with alterations recommended in the review

c)  the paper is to be returned to the reviewer after the recommended alterations have been made

d)  the paper is not appropriate for publication

*Categorization of research papers*

1. An *original scholarly paper* contains the results of original scholarly research. The data obtained from the research is presented such that it may be verified, and the processes undertaken during the research are described such that they may be repeated.
2. A *preliminary communication* is a scholarly work containing one or more new pieces of scientific data, which do not significantly change existing scientific knowledge.
3. A *review article* is a scholarly work that provides an overview and analysis of published scientific information from a specific area. As the author of this type of paper bases his or her research on an analysis of research that has already been published, the paper must visibly display the author’s contribution to the subject through his or her critical analysis.
4. A *professional paper* contains information that is already known or has already been published, and focuses on their application or promulgation for educational purposes.

*Guidelines for categorization of the author's paper*

a)  appropriate scientific structure and research paper methodology

b)  determination, presentation and development of theme

c)  brief general outline and introduction to the problem

d)  well-structured content and clarity of exposition with regard to readers

e)  references to relevant foreign and domestic literature

f)  importance and topicality of subject treated, at home and abroad

g)  originality and scientific contribution of paper and author's personal stance and reflections

h)  clarity, conciseness and informativeness of research paper title

i)  usage of scientific and expert terminology

j)  well-foundedness of the conclusion, i.e. of the paper's claims, questions and recommendations