

Guidelines for Peer Reviewers

NBP. Nauka, bezbednost, policija – Journal of Criminalistics and Law is an interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary journal inviting authors and reviewers from various disciplines within the wide scope of police science, criminology and law. The editorial board of the journal strives to ensure the high quality of the works it publishes, and the reviewers' participation in this process is of invaluable importance. We particularly encourage developmental reviews where even a rejection provides authors with valuable advice.

The points below provide general guidelines for peer review process.

Deadline for sending the review. Please try to meet the deadline of 2 weeks after you have agreed to review the manuscript. If you need more time, please just let the managing editor know when to expect your review.

Ethical rules. Review process is a double-blind one. Reviewers should inform the section editor if there is a conflict of interest when it comes to reviewing a specific manuscript as well as if they notice any violation of the ethical and scientific code in the manuscript. If you notice plagiarism or other breaches of ethics during your review, please notify the section editor. Each manuscript should be considered confidential document. Under no circumstances should you distribute them further or make any other use of them until the paper is published.

Manuscript evaluation process. When evaluating the manuscript, the reviewer should assess whether it is an original work, whether thematically corresponds to the profile of the NBP journal, whether it is based on relevant scientific knowledge from the given field and whether it contains all the necessary elements provided by the instructions for manuscript preparation: title, abstract, keywords, basic text of the paper, references. You should especially consider: Does the title properly reflect the subject of the paper? Does the abstract provide good summary of the paper? Do the keywords accurately reflect the content? Is the paper an appropriate length? Is it well written and clear? Does it make a significant scientific contribution? Are the conclusions consistent with the evidence and arguments presented? Can the flaws in the manuscript be remedied in a revision?

The reviewer assesses in particular whether a manuscript meet following criteria: 1) it has not been published, in whole or in part, in another journal; 2) it is appropriate for the *NBP. Nauka, bezbednost, policija – Journal of Criminalistics and Law*; 3) it is accurate, and the conclusions follow from the data; 4) it makes an important contribution to the literature.

In your narrative evaluation, please try to give positive feedback first. If you give negative feedback to the author, please try to do this in a constructive way. Indicate the significance of the work, the work's strengths, its quality and completeness. Then state any major flaws or weaknesses and note any special considerations.

When you make recommendations to the author, please provide your comments in enough detail so that they can be well understood. If *major revisions* are required, try to indicate clearly what they are. Even if you find the manuscript seriously flawed and intend to recommend its rejection try to provide clear, helpful, educative feedback, and give the author some suggestions how the article might be improved.

Please indicate also if there are any *minor issues* in the manuscript, e.g., ambiguous meanings, incorrect reference citing, factual, numerical or unit errors, etc.

Finally, please make a recommendation to the section editor whether the manuscript should be accepted, rejected, or returned to the author with an invitation to revise and resubmit. In the case of recommending revision of the manuscript, state clearly the changes that should be made. In case it is proposed that the manuscript should be rejected, a concise explanation should be given. Once you've evaluated the files, you'll be asked to enter your review in two text boxes. You should put *comments intended to be shared with the author* in the first text area. The second text area is for *comments intended only for the editor*. The editor will have access to all of your comments. But this provides you with a way to share information privately with the editor, which may not be appropriate to share with the author. Please note that the general recommendations concerning manuscript acceptance or rejection for publication should be made privately to the section editor. Narrative evaluations should not directly or indirectly communicate this recommendation to the author.

Reviewers are not expected to do proofreading of the paper, but we would appreciate if you indicate if the manuscript needs to be proofread.

We sincerely appreciate your valued assistance. Thank you!