

Reviewer Instructions

The Croatian Journal of Food Science and Technology (CJFST) relies on the time and expertise of volunteer reviewers to maintain its high editorial standards.

The review process is conducted anonymously. CJFST never reveals the identity of reviewers to authors. The privacy and anonymity provisions of this process extend to the reviewer, who should not reveal his or her identity to outsiders or members of the press. The review itself will be shared only with the author, and possibly with other reviewers and our Board.

Peer reviewers also have important responsibilities to authors, editors, and readers. Please consider them carefully.

Before you accept or decline paper review, consider the following questions:

- Does the paper match your area of expertise?
- Do you have a potential conflict of interest? Decline to review when a possibility of a conflict exists (see *Ethical Responsibilities and Confidentiality*).
- Do you have time?

Respond to the invitation as soon as you can - delay in your decision slows down the review process, whether you agree to review or not.

Reviewer competences

Reviewers who realize that their expertise in the subject of the article is limited have a responsibility to make their degree of competence clear to the editor. Although reviewers need not be expert in every aspect of the content, the assignment should be accepted only if they have adequate expertise to provide an authoritative assessment.

Reviewer responsibilities to authors:

- Provide written feedback on the scholarly merits and scientific value of the paper, together with rationale for your opinion.
- Provide your review within 20 days.
- Avoid personal comments or criticism.
- Refrain from direct author contact without the editor's permission.

Reviewer responsibilities to editors:

- Determine scientific merit, originality, and scope of the work and suggest ways to improve it.
- Avoid comments to authors about acceptance or rejection of the paper; include such remarks as confidential comments for editors.
- Note any ethical concerns, such as substantial similarity between the reviewed manuscript and any published paper or any manuscript concurrently submitted elsewhere.

Reviewer comments

Reviewer comments should be based solely on the paper's scientific merit, originality, and quality of writing as well as on its relevance to [*CJFST aims and scope*](#).

Reviewer should explain and support his judgment so that editors and authors may understand the basis of the comments. Your comments should acknowledge positive and negative aspects

of the material under review and provide constructive comments to help authors resolve weaknesses in the work. You should explain and support your judgement so that both editors and authors are able to fully understand the reasoning behind your comments. Comments should not include any personal remarks or personal details including your name.

Ethical Responsibilities and Confidentiality

Reviewers must not use knowledge of the work, before its publication, to further their own interests.

Material under review is a privileged communication that should not be shared or discussed with anyone outside the designated review process unless necessary and approved by the editor. Reviewers should not retain copies of submitted manuscripts and should not use the knowledge of manuscript content for any purpose unrelated to the peer-review process. The review process is conducted anonymously for all submissions.

Conflict of Interest

If reviewers have any interest that might interfere with an objective review, they should either decline to review a paper or disclose the potential conflict of interest to CJFST ([Conflict of Interest Policy](#)).

Conflict of Interest Policy

Authors are requested to disclose any actual or potential conflict of interest including any financial, personal or other relationships with other people or organizations within three years of beginning the submitted work that could inappropriately influence, or be perceived to influence, their work.

Reviewers must disclose to editors any conflicts of interest that could bias their opinions of the manuscript, and they should disqualify themselves from reviewing specific manuscripts if they believe it to be appropriate. Conflict of interest for a given manuscript exists when a participant in the peer review and publication process—author, reviewer, and editor—has ties to activities that could inappropriately influence his / her judgment, regardless of whether judgment is, in fact, affected.

Financial relationships with industry (for example, employment, consultancies, stock ownership, ...), either directly or through immediate family, are usually considered the most important conflicts of interest. However, conflicts can occur for other reasons, such as personal relationships, academic competition, and intellectual passion.

Submission of manuscript by an editor or by author at same institution as one of the editors or by family member of editor or by author whose relationship with editor might create the perception of bias

The peer review process of above mentioned papers will be handled by one of the editorial board member who does not have conflicts of interest with the authors or paper.