

SMJERNICE ZA RECENZIRANJE

Procjena recenzenata jest ključna stavka koja pomaže uredništvu u odluci o objavi rukopisa. Molimo recenzente da, u skladu sa svojim područjima ekspertize, recenziji pristupe konstruktivno i kurtoazno, te da svojom evaluacijom pomognu autorima u poboljšanju njihovih rukopisa.

U svojoj recenziji, molimo vas da razmotrite sljedeće elemente:

(1) Procjena rukopisa. Osim općenite procjene rukopisa, molimo da također komentirate:

- Strukturu i logičku organizaciju rada i njegovu jasnoću.
- Originalnost i znanstveni doprinos rada.
- Adekvatnost naslova rada, sažetka, grafičkih priloga te uporabe znanstvene terminologije.

(2) Opće napomene. Molimo Vas da obratite pažnju na relevantnost teme, metodološku i teorijsku primjerenost rada, podatke i grafičke priloge, uvjerljivost argumentacije, utemeljenost rasprave u nalazima rada te valjanost zaključaka. Navedite pozitivne aspekte rada, odnosno prigovore. Ukoliko se predlaže odbijanje rada, ovdje navesti argumente.

(3) Posebne napomene o recenziranom radu. Molimo Vas da navedete posebne napomene o pojedinim dijelovima rada poput potrebe za sažimanjem ili izostavljanjem, odnosno za dodatnim objašnjenjem određenih dijelova rada i sl. Ovdje navesti i moguće pogreške koje se nalaze u radu.

(4) Preporuke autoru/ima rada. Molimo Vas da navedete konkretne sugestije autoru/ima kako poboljšati rad (samo ukoliko rad predlažete za objavljivanje).

REVIEW GUIDELINES

Reviewer evaluation is the key element helping the editorial team decide whether to publish the article. We ask the reviewers to consider their areas of expertise and to approach their review in a constructive and courteous manner which will help the authors strengthen their manuscripts.

In your review, please, consider the following elements:

(1) Evaluation of the manuscript. In addition to general opinion on the paper, we also suggest commenting on:

- Manuscript's composition, comprehensive organisation and clarity.
- Originality and scientific contribution of the paper.
- Appropriateness of the title, abstract, graphics and scientific terminology.

(2) General comments. In this section, you are invited to elaborate on points such as the relevance of the topic, the appropriateness of the manuscript's theoretical and methodological framework, data and graphics, structure of the argument, consistency of discussion with the findings, validity of the conclusions. Please, address the strengths and the weaknesses of the manuscript. If advising the editor to reject the manuscript, please specify reasons for your recommendation.

(3) Specific comments. In this section you can specify requests for specific modifications, such as shortening the text or adding additional explanations, etc. Here you can also point out specific errors identified in the manuscript.

(4) Recommendations to the author/s. Please, specify concrete recommendations on how the author/s can improve the text (only recommend the manuscript for publication).

ETIČKE SMJERNICE

Revija za sociologiju slijedi dolje navedene smjernice Odbora za izdavačku etiku (Committee on Publication Ethics, COPE):

Sumnja u neetičnost. Ako sumnjate na bilo kakve nepravilnosti vezane uz etiku istraživanja i objavljivanja, molimo vas da obavijestite uredništvo. Na primjer, moguće je da vas brine neki aspekt etičnosti istraživanja ili pisanja i predaje rukopisa ili ste uočili dvostruku publikaciju zaprimljenog rukopisa (značajnu sličnost rukopisa s istovremeno podnešenim drugom časopisu ili s ranije objavljenim člankom). U slučaju ovih ili bilo kojih drugih etičkih problema, izravno kontaktirajte urednika i ne pokušavajte sami dalje istraživati. Primjeren je postupak povjerljiva suradnje s uredništvom, ali ne i daljnje osobno istraživanje, osim u slučaju da časopis zatraži dodatne informacije ili savjete.

Prenosivost recenzije. Ako je rukopis odbijen u jednom časopisu i prijavljen drugom, a od vas se traži da pregledate isti rukopis, pokušajte taj rukopis iznova evaluirati, budući da je u međuvremenu moglo doći do promjena u rukopisu, a kriteriji časopisa za ocjenjivanje i prihvaćanje mogu biti različiti. U interesu transparentnosti i učinkovitosti, primjereno jest novom časopisu predati vašu originalnu recenziju (uz dopuštenje izvornog časopisa), uz napomenu da ste taj rad već evaluirali te s bilješkom o promjenama

Prijedlozi za daljnji rad. Zadatak je recenzenta ocijeniti kvalitetu zaprimljenog rukopisa. Ako je rukopis nejasan jer mu nedostaju analize, recenzent bi to trebao komentirati i objasniti koje bi dodatne analize razjasnile rukopis. Posao recenzenta nije da proširi rad izvan sadašnjeg opsega. Budite jasni koje su (ako ih ima) sugestije za dodatnu analizu neophodne za održavanje tvrdnji iz rukopisa, a koje će samo ojačati ili proširiti rad.

ETHICS GUIDELINES

Croatian Sociological Review adheres to the following guidelines of the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE):

Suspicion of ethics violations. If you come across any irregularities with respect to research and publication ethics do let the journal know. For example, you may have concerns that misconduct occurred during either the research or the writing and submission of the manuscript, or you may notice substantial similarity between the manuscript and a concurrent submission to another journal or a published article. In the case of these or any other ethical concerns, contact the editor directly and do not attempt to investigate on your own. It is appropriate to cooperate, in confidence, with the journal, but not to personally investigate further unless the journal asks for additional information or advice.

Transferability of peer review. If a manuscript is rejected from one journal and submitted to another, and you are asked to review that same manuscript, you should be prepared to review the manuscript afresh as it may have changed between the two submissions and the journal's criteria for evaluation and acceptance may be different. In the interests of transparency and efficiency it may be appropriate to provide your original review for the new journal (with permission to do so from the original journal), explaining that you had reviewed the submission previously and noting any changes.

Suggestions for further work. It is the job of the peer reviewer to comment on the quality and rigour of the work they receive. If the work is not clear because of missing analyses, the reviewer should comment and explain what additional analyses would clarify the work submitted. It is not the job of the reviewer to extend the work beyond its current scope. Be clear which (if any) suggested additional investigations are essential to support claims made in the

Odgovornost. Pripremite izvješće sami, osim ako nemate dopuštenje uredništva za uključivanje drugih osoba. Suzdržite se od davanja nepoštenih negativnih komentara ili neopravdanih kritika bilo kojeg rada spomenutog u rukopisu. Suzdržite se od sugeriranja da autori uključuju navode vašeg rada (ili rada vaših suradnika) samo radi povećanja broja citata ili povećanja vidljivosti vašeg rada ili rada vašeg suradnika; prijedlozi moraju biti utemeljeni na valjanim akademskim ili tehnološkim argumentima. Ne produžite namjerno postupak recenzije odgađanjem slanja recenzije ili traženjem nepotrebnih dodatnih informacija od uredništva ili autora.

Izvor: COPE Council. Ethical guidelines for peer reviewers. September 2017. www.publicationethics.org

UREĐIVAČKA POLITIKA O ISKAZIVANJU SUKOBIA INTERESA

Od recenzenata se traži da iskažu postojanje bilo kojeg i svih sukoba interesa - financijskih, osobnih, profesionalnih ili institucionalnih, bilo stvarnih bilo percipiranih - koji se pojave u bilo kojem stadiju recenziranja ovog rukopisa.

Revija za sociologiju slijedi dolje navedene smjernice Odbora za izdavačku etiku (Committee on Publication Ethics, COPE):

Sukob interesa. Molimo da informirate uredništvo o svim potencijalnim sukobima interesima. Ako niste sigurni u potencijalni sukob interesa koji bi mogao utjecati na recenziranje, iznesite to uredništvu. Sukob interesa može biti osobne, financijske, intelektualne, profesionalne, političke ili vjerske prirode. Ako ste trenutno zaposleni u istoj ustanovi kao i autor(i) ili ste nedavno bili (npr. u posljednje 3 godine) mentor, mentorirani, bliski suradnik ili nositelj zajedničkih potpora, ne biste trebali pristati na recenziranje.

manuscript under consideration and which will just strengthen or extend the work.

Accountability. Prepare the report by yourself, unless you have permission from the journal to involve another person. Refrain from making unfair negative comments or including unjustified criticisms of any competitors' work that is mentioned in the manuscript. Refrain from suggesting that authors include citations to your (or an associate's) work merely to increase citation counts or to enhance the visibility of your or your associate's work; suggestions must be based on valid academic or technological reasons. Do not intentionally prolong the review process, either by delaying the submission of your review or by requesting unnecessary additional information from the journal or author.

Source: COPE Council. Ethical guidelines for peer reviewers. September 2017. www.publicationethics.org

COMPETING INTERESTS DISCLOSURE POLICY

Reviewers are asked to declare any and all competing interests - financial, personal, professional or institutional, whether real or perceived - that emerge at any stage of the peer review process:

Croatian Sociological Review adheres to the following guidelines of the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE):

Competing interests. Ensure you declare all potential competing, or conflicting, interests. If you are unsure about a potential competing interest that may prevent you from reviewing, do raise this issue with the editorial office. Competing interests may be personal, financial, intellectual, professional, political or religious in nature. If you are currently employed at the same institution as any of the authors or have been recent (e.g., within the past 3 years) mentors, mentees, close

Osim toga, ne biste trebali pristati recenzirati samo radi uvida u rukopis, bez namjere da podnesete recenziju ili pristati recenzirati rukopis koji je vrlo sličan onom koji pripremate ili je u postupku objavljivanja u drugom časopisu.

Važno je ostati nepristran bez obzira na nacionalnu pripadnost, vjerska ili politička uvjerenja, spol ili druga obilježja autora, porijeklo rukopisa ili komercijalne interese. Ako ustanovite sukob interesa koji bi vas mogao spriječiti u pravednom i nepristranom pregledu, obavijestite uredništvo i potražite savjet. Dok čekate odgovor, suzdržite se od gledanja rukopisa i pripadajućeg materijala u slučaju da se zahtjev za recenziju poništi. Također, obavijestite uredništvo što je prije moguće ukoliko smatrate da nemate potrebnu stručnost za procjenu relevantnih aspekata rukopisa kako ne biste neopravdano odgodili postupak recenzije. Ako sumnjate u identitet autora, obavijestite uredništvo ako to saznanje potakne bilo kakav potencijalni sukob interesa.

Povjerljivost. Poštujte povjerljivost postupka recenzije i suzdržavajte se od korištenja informacije iz postupka recenzije za stjecanje osobne ili tuđe koristi ili na štetu drugih. Ne uključujte druge u postupak recenzije rukopisa (uključujući mlađe znanstvenike koje mentorirate), ako prethodno ne dobijete dopuštenje uredništva. Imena svih uključenih u postupak recenzije trebaju biti uvedena u evidenciju uredništva kako bi se njihov rad mogao prepoznati.

Izvor: Source: COPE Council. Ethical guidelines for peer reviewers. September 2017. www.publicationethics.org

collaborators or joint grant holders, you should not agree to review.

In addition, you should not agree to review a manuscript just to gain sight of it with no intention of submitting a review, or agree to review a manuscript that is very similar to one you have in preparation or under consideration at another journal.

It is important to remain unbiased by considerations related to the nationality, religious or political beliefs, gender or other characteristics of the authors, origins of a manuscript or by commercial considerations. If you discover a competing interest that might prevent you from providing a fair and unbiased review, notify the journal and seek advice. While waiting for a response, refrain from looking at the manuscript and associated material in case the request to review is rescinded. Similarly, notify the journal as soon as possible if you find you do not have the necessary expertise to assess the relevant aspects of a manuscript so as not to unduly delay the review process. In the case of double-blind review, if you suspect the identity of the author(s) notify the journal if this knowledge raises any potential competing or conflict of interest.

Confidentiality. Respect the confidentiality of the peer review process and refrain from using information obtained during the peer review process for your own or another's advantage, or to disadvantage or discredit others. Do not involve anyone else in the review of a manuscript (including early career researchers you are mentoring), without first obtaining permission from the journal. The names of any individuals who have helped with the review should be included so that they are associated with the manuscript in the journal's records and can also receive due recognition for their efforts.

Source: COPE Council. Ethical guidelines for peer reviewers. September 2017. www.publicationethics.org