

PEER REVIEW POLICY & PROCEDURES

Ishodišta / Originations / Începuturi Journal of Serbian Language, Culture & Civilisation

1. Submission of Articles

Ishodišta / Originations / Începuturi is an annual journal publishing papers presented at the international scientific conference “Material and Spiritual Culture of Serbs in Multiethnic and/or Peripheral Regions”, organised by the Centre for Scientific Research and Culture of Serbs in Romania (CCSCSR) in partnership with the West University of Timișoara and the Faculty of Philosophy of the University of Niš (Serbia).

The submission process takes place in two stages:

Stage 1 — Call for Papers (Abstracts)

The Call for Papers is issued at least four months before the conference and disseminated through the academic networks of partner institutions (UVT, University of Niš, Union of Serbs in Romania), by direct email to researchers in the field, and via the journal website (<https://ishodista.uvt.ro/>). Abstracts of 200–250 words are submitted electronically to the editorial addresses.

Stage 2 — Full Paper Submission

Full papers are submitted electronically after abstract acceptance, in .doc/.docx and .pdf formats, to:

- ishodista@gmail.com
- mradan54@yahoo.com
- mirjana.bojanic.cirkovic@filfak.ni.ac.rs

Papers must comply with the journal's style guide: Times New Roman 12pt, maximum 12 pages / 24,000 characters.

Accepted fields: linguistics (dialectology, lexicology, phonetics), ethnology, ethno-linguistics, history, literature, theology, and sociology — with subject matter related to Serbian communities in multiethnic and/or peripheral regions.

2. Review Procedure

The review procedure consists of two distinct stages: a preliminary internal evaluation, followed by external double-blind peer review, in accordance with international academic publishing standards.

2.1 Preliminary Internal Evaluation (Open Peer Review)

Submissions are first evaluated internally. Editorial board members, assigned according to the paper's subject area, assess whether the contribution fits the journal's scope and thematic profile, meets academic scientific standards, and demonstrates originality. The editorial board reserves the right to reject papers that do not meet these criteria.

2.2 Formal Pre-Check

The editorial team verifies whether the paper meets formal requirements (format, length, structure). Papers that do not meet the minimum conditions are returned to the authors without entering the review process.

2.3 Anonymisation

All author-identifying information (name, affiliation, acknowledgements, self-citations that could reveal identity) is removed from the manuscript before it is sent to reviewers. The manuscript is assigned an anonymous code; the code-author correspondence list is kept exclusively by the editor-in-chief.

2.4 Assignment of Reviewers

Each paper is assigned at least two independent reviewers, selected from the journal's reviewer committee or from outside it, based on subject-matter expertise. Selection criteria: expertise in the relevant field, absence of conflicts of interest with the authors, independence from the publishing institution. In the event of disagreement between the two reviewers, a third reviewer is requested.

2.5 Evaluation Criteria

Reviewers assess the following:

- Scientific originality and contribution to the field
- Clarity of research questions and objectives
- Appropriateness of methodology
- Quality of analysis and soundness of conclusions
- Accuracy and currency of bibliographic sources
- Clarity and correctness of academic style

2.6 Outcomes

The external review process takes a maximum of 30 days. Completed review forms, together with observations and recommendations, are returned to the editorial board. The reviewer recommends one of the following:

- (a) Accepted without modifications
- (b) Accepted with minor revisions — no re-review required
- (c) Accepted with major revisions — subject to re-review
- (d) Rejected

The final decision rests with the editor-in-chief, based on the review reports.

2.7 Confidentiality and Appeals

All participants in the review process are obliged to maintain confidentiality. Authors who believe that a decision was made based on incorrect or biased evaluations may submit a written, reasoned appeal to the editor-in-chief.