



Methodical Review

INSTRUCTIONS FOR REVIEWERS

The review process is 'double-blind'. Papers are forwarded to reviewers without any information about the author(s). Each paper is reviewed by two reviewers, whose identity remains unknown to the author(s). The decision to publish a paper is taken by the editorship on the basis of the reviews and comments of the author(s) about changes made in order to improve the quality of the paper. The time allotted for receiving reviews is three weeks.

We kindly ask reviewers to provide their personal information, data on the manuscript reviewed, suggestions on how to improve the paper, their categorisation of the paper, and their remarks on the manuscript reviewed on the *Review Form* (see below). Reviewers are suggested to provide a brief overview and structure of the manuscript in their remarks, followed by a rating of the content, logic, and the stylistic and linguistic quality of the paper (is the subject clear, are the title and headings appropriate, have the citations been properly done, do the citations contribute to the analysis of the subject, etc). This should be followed by an estimation of the theoretical soundness of the paper, the methodology used, and the plausibility of the argumentation, and it should be noted whether additional explanations or redactions should be undertaken (is the text too general, too long, or does it contain unnecessary information, is the visual data (if included) correctly displayed and justified by the content, and is statistical analysis (if present) correct), and whether the author relies only on the opinions of other authors or provides his/her own observations, comments, critiques, etc. The reviewer should then estimate how original the author's contribution is, also taking into consideration how well-represented the subject is in the scientific literature. The relevance of the literature used to the subject should also be commented on (primary or secondary sources, is the literature outdated or has the author also used more recent sources, has an important source been left out, etc). Finally, is the paper in its entirety appropriate for publication in a scientific journal: (1) if the reviewer's comments are accepted, (2) if the paper is thoroughly revised, (3) if the paper is revised and the revised version is reviewed again, or (4) it is not appropriate for publishing (mark the appropriate field in the *Review Form*).

Reviewer comments help authors to improve their papers or to better understand why their paper cannot be published in its current version. The reviewer can also mark part of his/her review as "for the editorship only", and this part will not be sent to the author.

If the reviewer suggests that the paper be published (with revisions or without), he/she must also suggest a categorisation for the paper (mark the appropriate field on the *Review Form*). The following categories are possible:

- *original article*: contains as-yet unpublished original research described in an objectively verifiable and complete manner.
- *Preliminary communication*: contains the preliminary results of scientific research that is underway. Such articles do not have to allow the verification of stated results. This also encompasses papers in which a new problem is described thoroughly and argumentation is indicated without being fully elaborated upon.
- *Review paper*: must be an original, concise, critical review of an area or its parts in which the author actively participates. The role of the author's original contribution to this area must be emphasised in relation to already-published papers, overviews of which must be included.
- *Professional paper*: contains useful contributions from the field and does not have to include original research. This also includes papers that consider the application of the results of already-published scientific research in practice, which are as such important to a particular profession.

Methodical Review supports the COPE guidelines for ethical publishing, which encourages reviewers: to respect deadlines for the submission of reviews and agreements with the editor as to extensions, if necessary; to treat the papers they review as confidential; to keep their comments objective and relevant to the content of the paper, and to refrain from criticising the author; to contact the editorship if they suspect plagiarism; and to inform the editorship if they are in a conflict of interest that might affect their objectivity in rating the paper (excerpt from the *Code of Conduct and Best Practice Guidelines for Journal Editors*, Committee on Publication Ethics; http://publicationethics.org/files/Code%20of%20Conduct_2.pdf).

Methodical Review

Filozofski fakultet / Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Ivana Lučića 3, HR-10000 Zagreb, Croatia
Phone: +385 (0)1 6111 808; Fax: +385 (0)1 6117 012; MB: 3251594; OIB: 06756605498
web: www.hrfd.hr, <http://hrcak.srce.hr/metodicki-ogledi>; e-mail: metodicki.ogledi@hrfd.hr; izagorac@ffzg.hr

REVIEW FORM

REVIEWER INFORMATION

(will not be available to the author):

FULL NAME	
TITLE	
NAME OF INSTITUTION	
SCIENTIST IDENTIFICATION NUMBER (only for reviewers from Croatia, and if the reviewer has one: http://www.mzos.hr/znanstvenik/znanstvenik.asp)	

INFORMATION ABOUT THE REVIEWED PAPER:

TITLE OF THE PAPER REVIEWED	
DATE OF REVIEW	

SUGGESTION OF THE REVIEWER:

- a) Publish after revision
- b) Publish after thorough revision
- c) Publish after thorough revision and re-review of revised version
- d) Do not publish

SUGGESTED CATEGORISATION OF THE PAPER:

- a) original article
- b) preliminary report
- c) overview
- d) expert article
- e) do not publish

REVIEW
