

Sveučilište Jurja Dobrile u Puli
Filozofski fakultet
Odsjek za povijest
I. Matetića Ronjgova 1, 52100 Pula, Hrvatska
tel. +385 52 377 500, fax +385 52 211 713
ffpu-povijest@unipu.hr
ffpu.unipu.hr



Juraj Dobrila University of Pula
Faculty of Humanities
Department of History
I. Matetića Ronjgova 1, HR-52100 Pula, Croatia
tel. +385 52 377 500, fax +385 52 211 713
ffpu-povijest@unipu.hr
ffpu.unipu.hr

HISTORY IN FLUX: GUIDELINES TO REVIEWERS

The reviewer's first responsibility is to critically but constructively evaluate the paper and write comments and advice about the research and the paper itself to help authors improve the presentation of their work. The assessment of the paper includes an assessment of the originality and importance of the research, the structure of the study, the methodology, the presentation of the results, the strength of the conclusion(s) and the overall quality of the paper.

Reviewers are obliged to inform the editors of any potential conflict of interest in relation to the authors or the content of their paper submitted for review. In most of such cases, they should recuse themselves from the review. Reviewers are obliged to report possible unethical behaviour of manuscript authors to the editors, especially if they notice various forms of plagiarism. Other reviewer responsibilities include treating the paper as a confidential document and performing the review in a timely manner. The reviewer should not show the paper to anyone without the express permission of the editors. Reviewers should be polite in their comments to the authors. The editors reserve the right to omit or withhold any remarks deemed inappropriate, when transmitting the reviewer's remarks to the authors. Reviewers may not use the data from the reviewed paper for their research. Reviewers should not communicate directly with the authors or reveal their identity anywhere except in the signing of the review form, unless otherwise agreed with the editors. The editors should give guidelines to reviewers, especially those who are new to the process, about the procedure and rules of review in their journal and how to fulfil their double obligation of giving constructive remarks to authors and advising to the editors.

Reviewers are advisors to both the author and the editors. The editors can request the reviewers' opinion on the acceptability of the paper for publication in the journal and should study the reviewers' advice with utmost care. The final decision regarding the publication of a paper rests solely with the editors. The review should be based on a careful analysis of the paper and the reviewer's good knowledge of the topic and relevant literature. The review should also point out possible shortcomings in the paper, and suggestions on additions or changes that would improve the paper are welcome. Papers should have two positive reviews. In case the categorizations suggested by the reviewers differ, the editors evaluate the paper with the higher of the two suggestions. The reviewers suggest the category of the paper according to the instructions of the Croatian Ministry of Science and Education:

1. Original scientific paper
2. Preliminary communication
3. Review article

For the explanation of each category, please see the review sheet.

HISTORY IN FLUX: REVIEW SHEET

This form is a part of the double-blind peer-reviewing process.
Please, treat the materials you receive as confidential documents.

Reviewer (name, title)	
Institution	
Croatian Researcher ID No.	

Title of the paper	
---------------------------	--

Overall assessment – evaluate the manuscript using the scale from 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent) (mark in bold):				
1	2	3	4	5

I propose that the paper be (mark in bold):	
1. published in present form	3. published after major corrections
2. published after minor corrections	4. denied publication

I propose the following categorization (mark the category name in bold):	
1. Original scientific paper <i>(izvorni znanstveni rad)</i>	Original scientific paper means it is the first publication of original research. It must be presented so that the research can be repeated giving results with equal precision within the limits of the trial error, which means that the correctness of analyses and conclusions can be checked.
2. Preliminary communication <i>(prethodno priopćenje)</i>	Preliminary communication includes new scientific results demanding urgent publication while the research is underway. This kind of article does not have to ensure the repetition and checking the presented results. It is published only with the author's obligation to publish the original scientific paper when the research is completed.
3. Review article <i>(pregledni rad)</i>	Review article is a complete review of a problem or a field of research based on already published work but contains original analyses synthesis or suggestions for further research. It has a more comprehensive introduction than the original scientific paper.

Reviewer's comments on the next page
Please, provide clear explanation and argumentation regarding publication and categorization. Comment on the importance of the research subject, the validity of employed approach and presentation, the suitability in the treatment of the sources and literature, the validity of conclusions, the originality of the paper and its scholarly contribution. The commentary should aim at helping the author(s) to revise the paper, if necessary.

Review Date		Signature	
--------------------	--	------------------	--

Please, sign and send the entire document as pdf to the journal editor.

Reviewer's comments

...