

State Attorney's Office Opens the Dialogue (DOOR)

Referee Report Form

Title of Article:	
Referee:	

Thank you for agreeing to referee the attached manuscript that has been submitted for possible publication in "State Attorney's Office Opens the Dialogue" (DOOR). The DOOR adheres to a double-blind peer review method, meaning that you receive an anonymised contribution as well as the fact that your identity as a referee will remain confidential. We ask that you maintain the integrity of the process at all times.

The review process

The refereeing process is essential to maintaining the quality of the material published. The more detailed the comments that you are able to provide, the more the publication can still be improved and the better informed the decision on the publication will be.

Publications in the DOOR must fall within the mission statement of the journal:

The DOOR journal publishes works primarily in the fields of law and legal sciences, as well as social sciences. The journal publishes scholarly and professional articles on legal and related topics, interviews with contributors to legal development, commentaries and analyses of domestic and international jurisprudence, reviews of legislative reforms, evaluations of new laws, bylaws, international treaties, and conventions, along with book reviews, conference reports, and summaries of professional meetings.

The journal consists of five sections: *In Black and White*, *Word for Word*, *Chronicles*, *Under the Spotlight*, and *AI is (not) always right*.

The *In Black and White* section features articles on various areas of law.

The *Word for Word* section is dedicated to interviews with individuals who have contributed to the development of democracy, law, and legal scholarship through their work.

The *Chronicles* section covers court cases and events that have influenced the development of law and legal scholarship both domestically and internationally.

The *Under the Spotlight* section includes reviews and articles on judicial practice, as well as current developments in law, legal scholarship, and related fields.

Lastly, the *AI is (not) always right* section presents articles, reviews, and analyses of judicial practice and current trends in cybercrime, as well as the impact of artificial intelligence and technology on the evolution of law, legal scholarship, and the legal profession.

We ask you to do three things:

1. Please evaluate the paper according to the following elements:

	YES	NO	SUGGESTIONS
The title of the paper is appropriate.			
The summary and keywords are appropriate.			
The goal of the paper is clearly stated in the introduction.			
The structure of the paper is adequate.			
The paper makes use of appropriate scholarly and professional sources; the reference list is up to date and relevant.			
In case important scientific sources are missing from the reference list, please provide some examples.			
The methodology of the paper is adequate, has been clearly explained and properly implemented.			
The conclusions presented in the paper stem from the methodology implemented, as well as from the theoretical basis presented.			
The main topic of the paper has been clearly developed and the results obtained are adequate.			
The paper is an original contribution to science.			
The citations and reference list are in accordance with professional standards.			
Changes are required before publication.			

The suggestions will be anonymised and forwarded to the author(s) unless requested otherwise.

2. Please, where you regard this as necessary or useful, make annotations on the electronic copy of the manuscript using any method that clearly differentiates your text from the author's, such as block letters, a different coloured text or the "track changes" function of Microsoft Word. These comments will be anonymised and then forwarded to the author(s).

3. Please, give your final assessment by ticking the appropriate box:

The manuscript

1. Is acceptable for publication in its present format;
2. Is acceptable for publication, subject to minor revision, as indicated;
3. Is not acceptable for publication in its present format, but could be re-submitted after revision, as indicated;
4. is not acceptable for publication and should be rejected.

The manuscript

1. Scientific paper
2. Professional paper

If a manuscript is categorized as a scientific paper, the manuscript is:

1. Original scientific paper
2. Preliminary communication
3. Review article

Our sincerest thanks for your time and effort to assist us with the review process.

On behalf of the board of editors of the DOOR,

Ivan Turudić
Editor-in-Chief