

INVITATION AND INSTRUCTIONS FOR REVIEWING

We invite scholars, experts in various areas of social sciences to join us as reviewers in creating our international journal CIVITAS. Particularly, we invite scholars from academic communities in the region to contact us by means of links given in the journal and on our internet site.

THE RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE REVIEWERS

The reviewers are required to deliver the assessment of the scientific value of the manuscript to the editor in chief within set time limits. The assessment should be competent, well-supported and impartial.

The reviewers evaluate the works according to the following criteria: the topic should fit the profile of the journal, the subject investigated and the methods applied should be relevant, originality and scientific relevance of the facts presented in the manuscript should be beyond dispute, the style of the presentation should be clear and adequacy of the scientific apparatus provided.

In case the reviewer has reasonable doubts or evidence regarding violation of ethical standards in the work he/she is reviewing, he/she should notify the editor in chief immediately. The reviewer is required to recognize the important works already published that were not cited by the author. He/she should inform the editor in chief in case relevant similarities and convergences to any other paper already published or manuscript currently under review in some other journal and the manuscript under inspection are discovered or the reviewer has personal information about that. If the reviewer has information about the same manuscript being reviewed in more than one journal at the time, he/she should notify the editor in chief.

The reviewer must not be in any conflict of interest with the authors or financial supporters of the research project. In case there is a conflict of interest the reviewer is required to inform the editor.

If the reviewer considers himself not sufficiently qualified for the theme or area of research presented in the manuscript, he/she should notify the editor.

The review must be objective. Comments related to the personality of the author will be considered inappropriate. The evaluation must be clear and supported by arguments.

The manuscripts sent to the reviewer are considered confidential documents. The reviewers are not allowed to use unpublished material from the manuscripts for their own research without explicit consent of the author in writing; all the information and ideas presented in the manuscripts entrusted to the reviewers must be kept confidential and must not be used for personal benefit.

THE REVIEWING PROCEDURE

Every submitted manuscript must be reviewed. The aim of the review is to help make decisions about whether to accept the work or reject it; moreover, through communication with the authors to help improve the quality of the work.

The review is anonymous.

In reviewing two reviewers take part.

The time limit set to completing the review is one month.

The choice of the reviewers is the decision of the editor in chief. The reviewers should have relevant knowledge concerning the topic the manuscript is about and should not be from the same institution as the author; moreover, reviewers should not be author(s) who have (recently) coauthored with any of the author(s) of the manuscript under consideration.

The reviewing procedure is as follows. The editor in chief sends a manuscript submitted to the reviewers who are experts on the specific topic. The review form contains a questionnaire indicating the aspects that are of consequence to the acceptance of the manuscript for publication. After answering the questions, in the second part of the form, the reviewers give their remarks and suggestions for improving the manuscript in written form.

During the procedure the reviewers work independently. The identity of the reviewers remains unknown to each other. If their decisions are divergent (accept/reject), the editor in chief may look for another expert opinion.

During the procedure the editor in chief may request additional information (including primary facts) if it is indispensable for evaluating the scientific contribution of the manuscript. The editor and the reviewers should keep the information confidential; it must not be used for personal benefit.

The editorial board should monitor the quality of the reviews received. If the authors have serious and documented complaints regarding the review, the editorial board will reexamine its objectivity and adherence to academic standards. If there is doubt regarding the objectivity or quality of the review, the editor in chief will consult other reviewers.