



### **Ethical guidelines for peer reviewers (extract)**

<https://doi.org/10.24318/cope.2019.1.9>

Peer review in all its forms plays an important role in ensuring the integrity of the scholarly record. The process depends to a large extent on trust, and requires that everyone involved behaves responsibly and ethically. Peer reviewers play a central and critical part in the peer-review process, but too often come to the role without any guidance and unaware of their ethical obligations. COPE has produced some guidelines which set out the basic principles and standards to which all peer reviewers should adhere during the peer-review process in research publication. The aim has been to make them generic so that they can be applied across disciplines.

Peer reviewers play a role in ensuring the integrity of the scholarly record. The peer review process depends to a large extent on the trust and willing participation of the scholarly community and requires that everyone involved behaves responsibly and ethically. Peer reviewers play a central and critical part in the peer review process, but may come to the role without any guidance and be unaware of their ethical obligations. Journals have an obligation to provide transparent policies for peer review, and reviewers have an obligation to conduct reviews in an ethical and accountable manner. Clear communication between the journal and the reviewers is essential to facilitate consistent, fair and timely review. COPE has heard cases from its members related to peer review issues and bases these guidelines, in part, on the collective experience and wisdom of the COPE Forum participants. It is hoped they will provide helpful guidance to researchers, be a reference for editors and publishers in guiding their reviewers, and act as an educational resource for institutions in training their students and researchers.

Peer review, for the purposes of these guidelines, refers to reviews provided on manuscript submissions to journals, but can also include reviews for other platforms and apply to public commenting that can occur pre- or post-publication. Reviews of other materials such as preprints, grants, books, conference proceeding submissions, registered reports (preregistered protocols), or data will have a similar underlying ethical framework, but the process will vary depending on the source material and the type of review requested. The model of peer review will also influence elements of the process.



## Evaluation process

First step in evaluation of received papers is editor-in-chief. **The editor-in-chief will also do a plagiarism-checking** (in cooperation with University North). If editor-in-chief is not satisfied with the paper, it will be rejected. If the answer is positive, then the paper is going to be sent to the reviewers according to hers/his expertise. Usually time frame for first evaluation is 6-8 weeks. First review comments are going to be sent to the author(s) for (not)acceptance. If author(s) does not want to accept comments and recommendations, that has to be explained with valid and strong arguments. In that case editor-in-chief and expert members within editorial board will take a final decision about the paper publication. If the author(s) whose paper was rejected during evaluation process is not satisfied with the Editors decision and explanation, author can proceed with future activities in accordance with the COPE guidelines available on their website: <https://publicationethics.org/management>).

## Upute za recenzente

Molimo recenzente obraćanje pozornosti na sljedeće stavke prilikom izrade recenzije:

- jasnoća, sažetost, čitljivost i sadržajnost naziva te samog rada u sadržajnom smislu;
- organizacija rada;
- ispravnost metodološkog postupka;
- izvornost rada te njegov mogući znanstveni doprinos;
- uporabljena literatura odnosno izvori koji su korišteni;
- primjerenost i točnost nazivlja koje autor koristi u radu;
- prijedlog za moguće promjene, dopune u radu;
- završna ocjena treba li rad biti objavljen bez ili nakon određenih intervencija u tekst, odnosno da rad nije preporučljiv za objavljivanje.

Prilikom davanja ocjene o radu, recenzenti se trebaju voditi po sljedećim ocjenama:

- Izvorni znanstveni rad - sadrži do sad još neobjavljene rezultate izvornih znanstvenih istraživanja, stavova, zaključaka;



- Prethodno priopćenje - iako sadrži nove rezultate znanstvenih istraživanja, stavova i/ili zaključaka, a potrebno ga je brzo objaviti
- Pregledni rad - sadrži izvoran prikaz pojedinog tematskog područja koje je na jasan, prihvatljiv napisano te daje doprinos znanosti
- Stručni rad - rad koji sadrži korisne i uporabljive prijedloge, stavove i mišljenja iz struke i za struku, te u pravilu ne predstavlja rezultat izvornih istraživanja.

### **Guidelines for reviewers**

Dear reviewers pay attention to the following items when writing a review:

- clarity, conciseness, legibility and content of the title and the article itself in terms of its content;
- article organization;
- correctness of the methodological procedure;
- literature and sources used for the article;
- adequacy and accuracy of the terminology used by the author in the article;
- proposal for possible changes, additions to the paper;
- final assessment of whether the paper should be published without or after certain interventions in the article; ie that the article is not recommended for publication.

When you are writing review, you should be guided by the following definitions:

- Original scientific paper - contains hitherto unpublished results of original scientific research, views and conclusions;
- Preliminary communication - although it contains new results of scientific research, views and/or conclusions, and needs to be published quickly;
- Review paper - contains an original overview of a particular thematic area that is written in a clear, acceptable way and contributes to the science;
- Professional paper - article that contains useful and usable suggestions, attitudes and opinions from the experts and for the experts, and, as a rule, does not represent the result of original research.