



GUIDELINES FOR REVIEWERS

Reviewers are consultants to the editor-in-chief and members of the editorial board. Through indirect communication with the author of the paper, the reviewer contributes to improving the quality of the submitted paper. The reviewer considers its value and suggests the academic category of the paper and whether the article should be published, while the editor-in-chief together with members of the editorial board makes the final decision. If the reviewer is in a conflict of interest, he or she is expected to be excluded from the peer review process and notify the editor-in-chief about that fact. By accepting the review assignment, the reviewer acknowledges that there is no conflict of interest between the review and other professional or personal roles.

If a selected reviewer is unable to evaluate the paper or feels that they are not qualified to review a manuscript, they are obliged to inform the editor-in-chief as soon as possible. After that, members of the editorial board suggest another reviewer.

Reviewers enter their evaluation of the manuscript and suggest its categorization in the received review form. Peer review should be objective and scientifically based. Reviewers critically and constructively evaluate the received manuscript and make their own clear and constructive views, suggestions, and comments. Reviewers are obliged to warn about relevant published works that authors failed to cite and to draw the attention of the editor-in-chief to possible cases of plagiarism, copyright infringement, or other unacceptable actions.

Each manuscript is judged impartially, based on intellectual content and independent of the gender, race, citizenship, and ethnicity of each author, as well as his / her religious, ideological or political beliefs, scientific title, institutional affiliation, reputation in the academic community, or other similar determinations.

Reviewers must not communicate directly with authors, disclose or disseminate news about research that has been rejected and has not been published. Also, they must not use the research information for their own research and they are required to treat received manuscripts as confidential documents. Reviewers are not allowed to talk to anyone about the received manuscripts, excepting the editor-in-chief.

Inappropriate and personal comments are considered inadmissible.

In reviewing the article, the reviewer must identify:

- whether the topic is scientifically relevant
- whether the abstract and title correspond to the content
- whether scientific methods are used
- whether appropriate literature is used
- whether the article is written coherently, logically and whether it is linguistically accurate
- whether appropriate terminology is used
- whether there are any repetitions in the article
- whether there are any mistakes in data processing/ analysis
- whether the article conveys scientific innovations
- whether other authors are accurately cited.

The review of the paper in the peer review form must be accompanied by a minimum of 100 words of explanation.

After reviews are completed, before deciding whether or not to publish the article, the editor in chief may request additional review and advice. The editorial board then considers whether the article is going to be published and whether any changes are necessary. If the article contains changes or additions that could affect validity of the conclusions, the editor in chief can again seek reviewers' advice. As a rule, the editorial board evaluates papers submitted to the *Journal* after the required changes are made and does not send them back to reviewers.

This journal uses double-blind peer review, which means that the reviewer is not allowed to write personal information on the copy of the review which is sent to the author, but should reveal his identity only to the editorial board.

With reference to this, review form should be submitted electronically in two copies. One copy should be signed and should contain personal information, the other one should not be signed and should not contain any personal information. The peer review deadline is twenty days.

Editorial Bord of *Journal of Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences in Split*
University of Split, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences in Split
Poljička cesta 35
HR – 21000 Split

e-mail: zbornik.ffst@gmail.com