

GUIDELINES FOR REVIEWERS

The revision process begins after authors submit their manuscripts to our website. Their manuscripts are first being examined by the editor-in-chief and if they are acceptable, they are sent to associate editors for a review process.

Each associate editor has his/her own particular branch of scientific knowledge and according to that specific field, manuscripts are sent to associate editors for revision. Their first obligation is the following: quick overview of the manuscript and deciding whether it is acceptable for further revision. After the first examination, in case a manuscript is acceptable, it must be sent for a review. Manuscripts are often being sent to more than just two reviewers. If the two reviewers have positive comments about a manuscript and the third reviewer has a completely negative feedback, the editor may accept the third opinion if it is more convincing than the first two.

Further on, if a manuscript has positive feedback from the reviewers, the associate editor has to contact the author in order to make required corrections (if suggested by the reviewers). Until an author corrects his/her manuscript as required, the revision is not considered complete. After the corrections are made, this is considered a final version of the manuscript and it can be sent to the editor-in-chief for making a final decision together with the associate editor. As all of our (former) Editorial Board members have become associate editors, they are very helpful in deciding on the final status of a paper. Their decision is always above that of the reviewers and they discuss it with the editor-in-chief who either agrees or disagrees.

The reviewers recommended by the author himself could sometimes be subjective and miss some crucial mistakes in a paper – accidentally or intentionally. For this reason, it is better to have an objective opinion from an independent reviewer who generally gives a much more detailed and a more accurate evaluation of a paper. Also, this opinion is often negative and is decisive when rejecting the manuscript. We keep all our reviewers completely anonymous so the authors cannot judge anyone for any reason.

The reason for immediate rejection could be the following: poor writing, non-scientific approach in writing, already a well-covered topic in many other sources, methods that were cutting-edge years ago and the like. Authors often do not follow the instructions for authors so plenty of corrections need to be made before a manuscript can be sent to the reviewers. This is why sometimes it takes a lot of time to prepare manuscripts before they are ready for the review process.

OVERVIEW OF THE MOST COMMON MISTAKES IN MANUSCRIPTS SUBMITTED IN CJF

We would like to draw your attention to the mistakes commonly encountered during submission and those seen in submitted manuscripts. To avoid some of the problems listed below, authors should consult recently published papers.

List of the most common mistakes during submission:

1. Using old instructions for authors. Updated instructions for authors can be found at http://ribarstvo.agr.hr/editors/author_instructions.php?lang=en

2. Manuscript not submitted initially as a single Word document file online
3. Manuscript exceeds 10 Mb
4. Copyright release form not filled out properly and submitted according to instructions for authors

List of the most common mistakes in manuscripts:

1. Title page incomplete or of incorrect format. Running title missing.
2. Abstract exceeds 300-word limit.
3. Incorrect presentation of scientific names.
4. Use of active voice (usually first-person plural). The passive voice must be used.
5. Inclusion of footnotes in the main text. This must be avoided.
6. The quality of figures is not adequate (clarity and font sizes), especially when reduced for publication.
7. Guidelines relating to tables, figures and their respective legends are not followed. Tables are not created using the table function. Common faults in excel graphs include boxes around the graph, scrappy symbols, poor joining lines between symbols, poorly labelled axes, title text in excel graph.
8. References are not prepared as given in the instructions for authors. In some cases authors may prepare manuscripts for other journals and then decide to submit them to the CJF without following the specific guidelines (e.g. in the text, “et al” should not be in italics).
9. Omission of date of the latest access when citing websites.