

## **REVIEWER GUIDELINES**

### **Ethic rules**

Reviews are constituent parts when we come to ensuring the quality of published research.

A reviewer who does not feel competent enough to review the delivered research or a reviewer who knows that he/she cannot review the paper fast enough, should contact an editor and withdraw from the act of reviewing.

All submissions are confidential. They must not be discussed with the third party without authorization of an editor.

Reviews must be objective. Personal criticism of an author is not allowed. Reviewers should express their opinion in a clear manner followed by strong arguments.

Reviewers should also warn the editor if they recognize significant resemblance to any other familiar published researches.

Unpublished material which is delivered must not be used for the purpose of a reviewer's personal research without the explicit approval of an author. Information or ideas which are available to a reviewer have to be considered as highly confidential and must not be used for personal intentions. Reviewers must retreat from the process of reviewing the paper in the case of a conflict of interests such as competitiveness, bonds with authors, legal entities or institutions.

### **Manuscript Assessment**

Reviewers will assess the paper following the appropriate blank form enclosed to this guideline.

Authors will not be familiar with the identity of a reviewer. This way the objectivity in evaluation and assessment will be ensured.

The reviewer's assessment should contain:

- the assessment of originality, as well as scientific or professional contribution of the paper,
- the assessment of the originality of the paper,
- the assessment of the applied methodology,
- the proposition for the classification into a category or paper type,
- the assessment of the used literature and
- the agreement for the publication of the paper.

The reviewed paper can be evaluated in the following manners:

- 1: The paper rejected: The content is inappropriate for the conference or of a poor worth.
- 2: The paper should be rejected: Basic failings in content or presentation or extremely poor language.
- 3: Marginal tendency that the paper will be rejected: Not so many failings: great changes needed in order for the paper to be acceptable; the content greatly covered by the literature.
- 4: Marginal tendency that the paper will be accepted: The content is appropriate but exactness, clarity, completeness and writing can be additionally improved.
- 5: The paper accepted: The content, presentation and writing fulfill professional norms; improvements possible but the paper can be accepted at this point.
- 6: The paper imperatively accepted: The candidate with an exceptional paper. Possible suggestions for additional improvements.

#### THE INSTRUCTIONS REGARDING THE REVIEW FORM COMPLETION

A reviewer should follow Reviewers' guidelines.

A reviewer gives recommendation/approval for the publishing of a paper in **the field 1**.

- 1: The paper rejected: The content is inappropriate for the conference or of a poor worth.
- 2: The paper should be rejected: Basic failings in content or presentation or extremely poor language.
- 3: Marginal tendency that the paper will be rejected: Not so many failings: great changes needed in order for the paper to be acceptable; the content greatly covered by the literature.
- 4: Marginal tendency that the paper will be accepted: The content is appropriate but exactness, clarity, completeness and writing can be additionally improved.
- 5: The paper accepted: The content, presentation and writing fulfill professional norms; improvements possible but the paper can be accepted at this point.
- 6: The paper imperatively accepted: The candidate with an exceptional paper. Possible suggestions for additional improvements.

A reviewer's opinion in the **field 2** should highlight the proposition for classification into a category or paper type, according to the following categories derived from the *Regulations on of Scientific Research Papers Publication*<sup>1</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> Pravilnik o publikovanju naučnih publikacija, Službeni glasnik RS br. 77/10.

**Categories:**

1. Original scientific article
  2. Review article
  3. Short or preliminary communications
  4. Scientific critique
  5. Informational contribution
  6. Book review
- Original scientific article is principally organized by the IMRAD scheme considering experimental researches or descriptively – for descriptive scientific fields, where a text about personal research results which follow scientific methods is published. These methods are described in text and they ensure the probable repetition of a research, and the control of established facts.
  - Review article represents a review of the newest research in a field with the aim to summarize, analyse, evaluate or synthesize published information, so it brings new synthesis which also include results of personal author's research.
  - Short or preliminary communications are papers of a smaller volume or of preliminary character, where some elements of IMRAD can be dropped, because it is a concise review of finished original research paper or working article results.
  - Scientific critique, i.e. debate or retrospect is a polemics on some scientific topic, based exclusively on a scientific argumentation, where the author proves regularity of an opinion criterion, that is – approval or refusal of other authors' results.
  - Informational contribution is an editorial, commentary and likewise.
  - Book review, a review of an instrument, a computer programme, a case, a scientific event and alike is a contribution in which an author evaluates regularity/irregularity of a scientific or professional work, a criterion, a postulate or starting point, where the quality of evaluated paper is especially highlighted.

In the **field 3**, a reviewer evaluates originality, i.e. scientific contribution of the paper.

**Evaluation:**

1. New information
2. Worthy confirmation of common knowledge
3. Clarity in representation
4. New perspective, or definition of a problem
5. Not much
6. Other

In the **field 4**, a reviewer evaluates originality, i.e. scientific contribution of a paper:

**Evaluation:**

1. New information
2. Worthy confirmation of common knowledge
3. Clarity in representation
4. New perspective, or definition of a problem
5. Not much
6. Other

In the **field 5**, a reviewer evaluates how much is the paper up-to-date to the existing trends in the field.

- low
- mediate
- high

In the **field 6**, a reviewer evaluates the used literature:

- yes
- no

In the **field 7**, a reviewer evaluates the length of paper (instructions for writing: 4-6 pages):

- appropriate
- inappropriate
- not sure

In the **field 8**, a reviewer evaluates if there is significant resemblance of a paper to other familiar published papers:

- yes
- no
- not sure

In the **field 9**, a reviewer provides suggestions and comments to the author:

Comments for the author:

We highly appreciate constructive comments for the author

In the **field 10**, a reviewer gives his final opinion and is obliged to fulfill this field with unique comments about the paper related to: the evaluation of methodology used, comments, recommendations.

Comments for the Organisational Board (authors will not see these comments):

The reasons must be included for all papers, because they help us decide in the cases of disagreement of two reviewers.