

## Guidelines for reviewers

### Categorization of papers

**Život umjetnosti** is a journal dedicated to topics from the fields of modern and contemporary art, urbanism, architecture, design, and theory relevant to said areas. **Život umjetnosti** publishes previously unpublished scholarly papers – papers presenting new results of scholarly research or new and adequately elaborated art-historical interpretations, papers addressing a certain topic at the level of scientifically sound theoretical deliberation, as well as papers defining the existing level of research regarding a particular topic in a competent manner. Papers are classified in accordance with the binding categorization defined by the Ministry of Science and Education of the Republic of Croatia. In addition to scholarly papers, professional papers and essays may be published in exceptional cases, provided that they are addressing relevant and interesting topics.

### Evaluation of papers

Reviewers should assess the scholarly authenticity of submissions, their text structure and cohesion, the authors' exactness regarding citation and comments on the work of previous authors addressing the same topic, and their transparent use of sources and literature. Poorly structured papers, papers with inadequately or vaguely elaborated theses, papers based on unprincipled use of literature, and papers addressing irrelevant topics will be considered unsuitable to the profile of the journal.

Reviews should be critical, objective, benevolent, and based on solid knowledge of the topic; they should indicate possible shortcomings and suggest additions or modifications that would contribute to the quality of papers. Reviewers should propose the classification of a paper in accordance with the binding categorization defined by the Ministry of Science and Education (original scholarly paper, preliminary statement, paper presented at a symposium, review paper). The editorial board will make the final decision about the category of a paper based on two, or exceptionally three, reviews.

### Elements of evaluation – general guidelines

1. **The topic.** Is the topic scholarly relevant?
2. **Title / abstract / keywords.** Do the suggested title, abstract and keywords correspond to the main text?
3. **Sources and literature.** Has the author addressed previous research of the same topic in a just manner? Has the author referred to relevant literature and archival sources? Has the author used professional literature in a transparent manner, by making clear distinctions between his/her own conclusions and existing knowledge? Has the author applied the proper norms for citing literature and sources, as defined in the journals' guidelines?
4. **Structure.** Has the topic been presented intelligibly and the text structured appropriately? Is the paper vague, needlessly extensive, or laden with repetitiveness or redundant information/illustrative material?
5. **Coherence and language.** Is the text coherent, i.e. have the theses been presented in a comprehensible manner? Has the main thesis been elaborated in a logical, consequential manner? Is the applied language appropriate, i.e. does it adhere to standard language?
6. **Specialized terminology.** Is the applied terminology common and appropriate to the language in which the paper has been written?
7. **Illustrative material.** Is the ratio between main text and the number of figures adequate or does the paper enclose too many/too few figures?
8. **Mistakes.** Have any mistakes been made in the elaboration of data, illustrative material etc.?
9. **Conclusion.** Have the stated conclusions derived from the content of the paper? Is the conclusion clear and unambiguous?
10. **Authenticity.** Has the paper brought forth new scholarly knowledge, new interpretations of scholarly knowledge or new theoretical solutions? Does the paper raise new issues for further scholarly discussion?

Based on the analysis of the above listed elements, the written part of the review should state in a clear manner all possible modifications that the author should include in order to improve his/her paper (corrections of inaccurate data, additions, reductions, interventions regarding text structure etc.). If modifications are required, reviewers must indicate them in a clear and direct manner, i.e. suggest possible adjustments.

Finally, reviewers must explicitly state whether they recommend the paper to be published in **Život umjetnosti** and what classification of the paper they are proposing.

Reviews enclosed with templates (review abstract) should be submitted:

- via e-mail [zivotumjetnosti@ipu.hr](mailto:zivotumjetnosti@ipu.hr);
- printed out and signed, via mail at the address: Institute of Art History, Ulica grada Vukovara 68, 10000 Zagreb, noted with "For the editorial board of Život umjetnosti".