Instructions for Reviewers

These Instructions prescribe the basic principles, standards and guidelines that reviewers should follow when reviewing articles submitted for publication in Bankarstvo Journal published by the Association of Serbian Banks.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Reviewer's Task

Article 1

The main task of reviewers is to evaluate each individual manuscript submitted to them, thus contributing to the improvement and maintenance of the high scientific research range and rank of the journal itself, as well as the author of the article.

In performing their task, the reviewer will pay special attention to the following:

- By submitting the text, the author has stated that the text has neither been published nor accepted for publication elsewhere and that it will not be submitted for publication to any other media.
- They are a copyright holder; they have been informed of the rights of third parties and have fulfilled the requirements arising from those rights.
- The submitted text must meet the standards that derive from adherence to the codes of academic ethics and scientific integrity.
- Reviewers are required to follow the recommendations and guidelines of the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) in the performance of their tasks.

Reviewer Rank

Article 2

Reviewers are usually of higher or equal rank (scientific or teaching title) as author of the paper they are reviewing.

The Obligation to Maintain a Code of Ethics and Scientific Integrity

Article 3

Reviewers have a duty to take care of ethical issues.

If the paper has been plagiarised or has already been published in another journal/proceedings/monograph, the reviewer is obliged to inform the editor without delay.

In particular, the reviewer should pay attention to whether the data and results are (scientifically) true.

If there is any doubt as to the accuracy of the results, the reviewer is obliged to inform the editor without delay.

The reviewer should inform the editor if they notice any other violation of the code of ethics and science in the paper.

Conflict of Interest

Article 4

The reviewer should inform the editor if there is a conflict of interest in reviewing a particular article.

The Form of the Review

Article 5

Peer review is done by filling out the Review Form, which is an integral part of these Instructions, or in electronic form through the Assistant platform available at:
http://aseestant.ceon.rs/index.php/gakv/index, and according to the technical instructions given in the annex to this act. The review form also contains Reviewer Information, which can be found on our website:

https://www.casopisbankarstvo.rs/en/instructions-for-authors-and-reviewers. Each reviewer may, in their own interest, within the same form, submit their ORCID number, bearing in mind that it is possible for papers published in SCIndex to be automatically linked to the ORCID accounts of the author, i.e. reviewer, as well as to their pages in e-Nauka and/or if the reviewer uses that platform.

Deadlines

Article 6

Reviewers have 15 days to submit their review to the Editorial Board electronically and on the prescribed digital form (Appendix to this Instruction).

At the justified request of the reviewer, the editor may extend the deadline referred to in the previous paragraph for another 14 days.

II INDEPENDENCE OF REVIEWERS

Prohibition of Influence Over the Work of Reviewers

Article 7

Reviewers are self-sufficient and independent in their work. No one can influence the work and evaluation of the reviewer.

A request from the editor or a member of the Editorial Board of the journal requesting the reviewer to adhere to the given deadlines, to state the reasons for exceeding the deadline and possible new deadlines in which the review could be completed, as well as the request to the reviewer to clarify a given comment or fill in a section of the review form that is not filled in at all or in a proper manner, is not considered to affect the work and assessment of the reviewer.

Peer Review Anonymity

Article 8

The peer review process is two-way anonymous and is conducted by two independent reviewers for each individual scientific article (*Double Blind Review*). The reviewers do not know who the authors of the paper are, nor do the authors of the paper know who the reviewer of their paper is.

The review process and content are considered confidential and the reviewer, as well as the members of the Editorial Board, must not disclose any details of this process to third parties.

Manuscript Confidentiality

Article 9

Each manuscript is treated as a confidential document and no information may be provided about it unless it has been approved by the editor-in-chief in order to obtain an objective evaluation of the text.

Manuscript data may not be used until the paper has been published.

Obligation to Inform

Article 10

If, during the review process, the reviewer has been exerted in any way that impairs or threatens their independence or the anonymity of the review process, the reviewer is obliged to inform the editor in writing without delay and suspend the review process until the conditions for further independent and anonymous work are created.

If the undue influence is exerted by the editor, the reviewer is obliged to inform the Publishing Council in writing without delay and suspend the review process until the conditions for further independent and anonymous work are created.

The Use of AI

Article 11

If the review was prepared using AI-based tools (e.g. ChatGPT), it is necessary for the reviewers to describe in the review how and in where they used such tools (e.g. to improve the quality of text in English, which is allowed).

Rating Reviewers

Article 12

In accordance with current regulations and standards, the evaluation of all reviewers by the Editorial Board as well as by the authors is a modern practice supported by both Bankarstvo Journal and its Editorial Board. The evaluation form is available at the link.

III EVALUATION OF THE ARTICLE

Subject of Evaluation

Article 13

When evaluating the paper, the reviewer evaluates whether it is an original scientific paper (or a review scientific paper, professional article) and whether it thematically and substantively corresponds to the profile of the journal, whether it is based on relevant scientific knowledge in the field and whether it contains all the necessary elements listed in the Instructions for Authors with citation rules: title, abstract, keywords, core text of the paper, summary, cited literature.

Article Categorisation Proposal

Article 14

The reviewer proposes the categorisation of the paper according to the following categories:

1. **The original scientific paper** should necessarily contain: the scientific context of the problem, with a review of the relevant results of previous research and the relevant literature, corpus, methods and goals of the research, and that, after analysing the researched problem, it should clearly present the results in its conclusion. It should be noted in the review if any of these elements are missing in the paper.
2. **A scientific review article** provides a comprehensive and critical review of a particular problem and relevant literature, a new synthesis of scientific information, points out similarities, differences and shortcomings in the existing literature, and should also contain a theoretically based position of the author.
3. **A short or preliminary statement** is an original scientific paper of full format, but of a smaller scope or of a preliminary character that contains previously unpublished results of completed scientific research. It does not exceed 1,000 words.
4. **Scientific criticism** is a discussion of a particular scientific topic based solely on scientific argumentation and the use of scientific methodology, and reviews.

Suggestions for Categorising a Non-Scientific Article

Article 15

If the paper that is the subject of the review does not meet the conditions to be published under one of the categories from the previous Article – as a scientific paper, the reviewer is obliged to declare whether the article can be published as a non-scientific article in one of the following categories:

1. **An expert article** is a contribution that offers experiences useful for the advancement of professional practice, but which are not necessarily based on the scientific method.
2. **Informative supplement (editorial, commentary)**
3. **A review is an overview of a** book, i.e. the topic that the book deals with, its significance and content, and may also include a review of the scientific and professional work of the author of that book. It can also be a review of banking practice, a review or analysis of a specific case or group of cases.
4. **Commentary** on cases from practice, including expert criticism, i.e. discourses and reviews.

Reviewer Opinion

Article 16

The reviewer's opinion should contain a brief description of the paper with an emphasis on the main contribution, as well as: the value of the presented paper, evaluation of the methodology of the approach to problem solving, the level and manner of presentation, sources of information, the need for shortening, changes and additions to the text, contributions, literature, terminological and stylistic clarifications.

A Proposal for Acceptance for Publication

Article 17

The reviewer may propose to the Editorial Board:

1. To accept the paper without change,
2. That the work is accepted on the condition that parts of the work are shortened, processed or omitted,
3. That the paper should be returned to the reviewer for final evaluation after the proposed changes,
4. Not to accept the paper.

In the event that the revision of the paper is recommended (points 2 and 3 of the previous paragraph), the reviewer states:

1. Changes that need to be made in order for the work to be published,
2. Changes that are recommended but not necessary.

In the event of a proposal not to accept the paper for publication, it is necessary to provide a concise explanation.

Please fill out the Paper Review Form by scoring each category with a grade (from 1 – worst, to 5 - best) by putting an X in the selected column. In addition, the reviewer needs to explain their assessment in the section below (Note), as well as fill out the section with personal data.

Please send your review to the e-mail address: bankarstvo@ubs-asb.com no later than 15 days after accepting the review.