



INSTRUCTIONS TO REVIEWERS

Reviewers recommend quality and classification of the article as well as the form of the article which is to be published or they recommend the article should not be published, but the editorial board reaches a final decision.

Peer review should be objective and scientifically based.

Reviewers are not allowed to use, for their own research, data described in the article which they are asked to review.

Reviewers are not allowed to communicate directly with authors or reveal their identity to them. Furthermore, they are not allowed to share information about the research which has not passed through peer review process and which has not been published. In peer review process the reviewer must establish:

- 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.

Besides, reviewers have to explain and complete the review with minimum 100 words.

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 goes to the author, but should reveal his identity only to the editorial board.

With reference to this, the review form should be submitted electronically. One copy should be signed and should contain personal information, while the other one should not be signed and should not contain any personal information. Reviewers can send the signed copy by email or by regular mail to the address of the editorial office.

Uredništvo *Zbornika radova Filozofskog fakulteta u Splitu*
Sveučilište u Splitu, Filozofski fakultet
Poljička cesta 35
HR - 21000 Split
e-mail: zbornik.ffst@gmail.com