

Peer Review Guidelines

1. INTRODUCTION

Review may be defined as a critical, multilayer written evaluation of the value of scientific or professional contributions intended for publication that may contain suggestions to improve the quality of the contribution.

The basic goal of the review is to submit to the Editorial Board all data they need to decide whether to publish an article or not. It shall prevent any publication of plagiarism and articles (e.g. research) with incorrect results. Another equally important goal of reviews is to allow the author to learn about the weaknesses or even errors of their work and correct or improve the quality of the submitted article.

The theory of writing scientific articles is part of science about science and can only be presented in these editorial instructions to reviewers to a limited extent. For this reason some related professional literature sources listed as references in the bibliography at the end of this text were used for the elaboration of these instructions. Reviewers are kindly requested to study these sources or perhaps find new, more recent works.

2. GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS

2.1 The review procedure will make sure that articles for Moderna arhivistika review are presented in accordance with the valid Slovenian SIST ISO standards for documentation, as well as international standards to be shortly adopted as Slovenian ISO standards of documentation and information science. Articles must be prepared according to the rules of good writing. All important standards are listed in the references.

Authors must follow Guidelines for writing.

2.2 The purpose of the review form is to assist reviewers and make their work more uniform. In this way the Editorial Board of Moderna arhivistika wishes to acquire concise and clear presentation of the review results. It is adapted for the reviewers of scientific articles. For other types of articles the reviewers are requested to apply it correspondingly and leave out the requirements exceeding their scope. If, for example, a professional article that does not represent repetition of a research but a description of another professional work is to be reviewed, generally the author does not have to make an initial hypothesis, etc.

2.3 Reviewing shall be more than (perhaps) mechanical completing of form columns. For this reason reviewers have a possibility to add their own comments in adequate form column (6 Special reviewer's findings), enclose comments to the form or write a separate reviewer's article. Especially in the latter case reviewers shall pay attention to meet the original goal of the review.

2.4 The reviewer should focus on the contextual aspect of the article (interest, innovation, suitability for publishing) since the authors who do not follow editorial guidelines are asked to correct their texts. However, the reviewer points to an eventual language inadequacy of the article (incorrect use of scientific terminology and language incomprehension) or inconsistencies at citing or at the scientific equipment of the article (footnotes, references).

2.5 The reviewer also points to eventual essential or slight remarks on the text. He/she also checks if the topic has already been researched and the author did not consider previous findings. The reviewer should also pay special attention to the methodological aspect of the article (suitability of used methods, sampling, hypothesizing) and the structure of the article. Minor remarks or/and corrections can be written in the text.

2.6 Reviewer decides whether the article is:

1. appropriate for publication without improvements;
2. appropriate for publication with minor improvements (editor's decision)
3. appropriate for publication after major improvements and another revision;
4. not appropriate for publication.

2.7 The reviewer defines the classification, which can differ from the one suggested by the author. Typology of documents/works for bibliography management in the Slovenian cooperative bibliographic system COBISS is used:

1.01 Original Scientific Article. An original scientific article is only the first-time publication of original research results in a way that allows the research to be repeated, and the findings checked. As a rule, it follows the IMRAD (Introduction, Methods, Results and Discussion) scheme for experimental research, or it is organised in a descriptive way for descriptive scientific areas.

1.02 Review Article. A review article is an overview of the latest works in a specific subject area, the works of an individual researcher or a group of researchers with the purpose of summarising, analysing, evaluating or synthesising the information that has already been published. A review article brings new syntheses, which also include the results of the author's own research.

1.03 Short Scientific article. A short scientific article is an original scientific article, in which some of the elements of the IMRAD scheme may be omitted. It briefly summarises the findings of a completed original research work or a research work in progress. Also included in this category are mini reviews and preliminary publications, if they have the characteristics of a short scientific article.

1.04 Professional Article. A professional article is the presentation of what is already known, with the emphasis on the applicability of original research results and the dissemination of knowledge, while the complexity of the text is adapted to the needs of the users and readers of the professional or scientific journal, in which the said article is published.

1.25 Other articles. All articles which could not be classified in any of the above-mentioned classes.

2.8 The reviewer may write the whole review as a special review paper or enclose part of it to the form.

The enclosure may include e.g.:

- special reviewer's observations that cannot be classified in the form columns,
- requests for corrections and completions of the reviewed text,
- comments related to the completion of the form, when considered necessary.

Especially negative evaluations and (later) recommendation to the Editorial Board not to publish the article require adequate argumentation.

2.9 Reviewers of individual articles are chosen by the editorial board respecting the anonymity of the review procedure. Reviews are given to authors anonymously. The reviewer keeps one copy of the review for his use in case of a new review. With signing this form, the reviewer declares that he/she will cooperate with the editorial board of Moderna arhivistika as a reviewer, will respect the process' anonymity principle and will not use information and findings from the reviewed article before its publishing.

2.10 Signed review should be sent to the editorial board address: Pokrajinski arhiv Maribor, Glavni trg 7, SI-2000 Maribor or scanned to nina.gostencnik@pokarh-mb.si.

Maribor, 01. 01. 2026, Editorial board of Moderna arhivistika