

Stručna recenzija na prekretnici? Kritički pogled na proces recenziranja u znanstvenim časopisima iz polja humanistike u Bosni i Hercegovini

Peer Review at a Crossroads? A Critical Insight into the Scholarly Review Process in Humanities Journals in Bosnia and Herzegovina

Ajla Demiragić

Univerzitet u Sarajevu – Filozofski fakultet, Odsjek za komparativnu književnost i informacijske nauke, Sarajevo, Bosna i Hercegovina / University of Sarajevo – Faculty of Philosophy, Department of Comparative Literature and Library Sciences, Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina

ajla.demiragic@ff.unsa.ba

Informacije o članku / Article Info

Primljen / Received 14. 9. 2025.

Prihvaćen / Accepted 29. 9. 2025.

Dostupan online / Available online: 25. 12. 2025.

Ključne riječi / Keywords

stručna recenzija, kriza recenzije, recenzenti, urednici, znanstveni časopisi iz polja humanistike, Bosna i Hercegovina

peer review, review crisis, reviewers, editors, scientific journals in the field of humanities, Bosnia and Herzegovina

Sažetak / Abstract

Ciljevi: Cilj ovog istraživanja je ispitati ulogu i status stručne recenzije u okviru akademskih časopisa iz područja humanističkih znanosti u BiH. Fokus je stavljen na analizu iskustva recenzentskog procesa među urednicima/icama časopisa u kojima objavljeni znanstveni i stručni članci prolaze kroz postupak dvostruke slijepe ili višestruke recenzije. Razmatrana su pitanja utjecaja recenzije na objavljivanje i akademsku evaluaciju, kao i na identificiranje ključnih izazova u ovom domenu specifičnih za bh. akademski kontekst.

Pristup/metodologija/dizajn: Istraživanje je provedeno kvalitativno, putem analize dostupne literature o ovoj problematici, te polustrukturiranih intervjua s bh. znanstvenicima/icama koji/e su angažirani/e kao urednici/e domaćih časopisa iz područja humanističkih znanosti.

Rezultati: Rezultati pokazuju da se neki aspekti krize recenzije koji su prepoznati na globalnoj razini detektiraju i u bh. kontekstu akademskog izdavaštva. Istaknuti su problemi poput ograničenog broja aktivnih recenzentata i nezadovoljavajuće spremnosti na suradnju stručnjaka i stručnjakinja čija je akademska afilijacija vezana za institucije izvan regiona. Isto tako, većina intervjuiranih urednika/urednica smatra da recenzentski rad nije adekvatno vrednovan u sustavu akademskog napredovanja, što može biti jedan od demotivirajućih faktora.

Originalnost/vrijednost: Istraživanje doprinosi boljem razumijevanju specifičnih izazova recenzentskog procesa u bh. akademskom kontekstu i može biti podsticaj za promišljanje i iznalaženje novih procedura i postupaka koji bi imali za cilj povećanje kvalitete recenzije i broja recenzentata kroz zagovaranje institucionalne akademske valorizacije recenzentskog rada.

Praktična primjena: Dobiveni nalazi mogu poslužiti uredništvima časopisa iz polja humanistike, kao i univerzitetkim tijelima nadležnim za akademsku evaluaciju u BiH pri redefiniranju kriterija za vrednovanje recenzentskog doprinosa, ali i pri izgradnji akademskih edukacijskih programa na temu unapređenja postupaka recenziranja.

Društveni značaj: Uspostavljanje kvalitetnog recenzentskog sustava doprinosi jačanju kritičkog mišljenja, argumentativne kulture i akademske odgovornosti, ali i osnaživanju kvaliteta i statusa znanja koja se proizvode u području humanističkih znanosti.

Objectives: This study aims to examine the role and status of peer review in academic journals within the humanities in Bosnia and Herzegovina. The research focuses on analysing the experiences of journal editors whose publications employ a double-blind or multiple-review process. It explores the impact of peer review on scholarly publishing and academic evaluation, while also identifying key challenges specific to the academic context of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

Approach/Methodology: A qualitative research design was employed, combining a review of relevant literature with semi-structured interviews conducted with editors of domestic humanities journals in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

Results: The findings indicate that several aspects of the global “peer review crisis” are also evident in the B&H academic publishing landscape. Notable issues include a limited pool of active reviewers, a general reluctance to engage with scholars affiliated with institutions outside the region, and a widespread perception that peer review is insufficiently recognized within systems of academic promotion—factors that may contribute to a lack of motivation among reviewers.

Originality/Value: This study contributes to a deeper understanding of the specific challenges faced by the peer review process in Bosnia and Herzegovina and may serve as a basis for rethinking procedures aimed at improving the quality and scope of peer review. It advocates for institutional recognition of peer review as a valuable academic activity.

Practical Implications: The findings may assist journal editors in the humanities, as well as university bodies responsible for academic evaluation in Bosnia and Herzegovina, in revising criteria for assessing reviewer contributions. Furthermore, they can inform the development of educational programs focused on enhancing peer review practices.

Social Significance: Establishing a robust and credible peer review system supports the development of critical thinking, a culture of argumentation, and academic accountability. It also enhances the quality and standing of knowledge production in the field of humanities.

1. Uvod

U okviru složenog sustava akademskog izdavaštva, stručna ocjena, odnosno recenzija, predstavlja jedan od ključnih koraka u procesu objavljivanja znanstvenih radova. Štaviše, neki autori naglašavaju da srž profesionalnog časopisa leži u predanosti, etici i preciznosti recenziranih radova (usp. Pearson, 2023; Petrișor, 2020). Dok je u slučaju monografija recenzijski postupak nešto drugačiji, generalni proces, odnosno hodogram kada je riječ o znanstvenim člancima u pravilu izgleda tako da autori/autorice šalju svoje radove znanstvenim i/ili stručnim časopisima, u nadi da će biti objavljeni. U slučaju zatvorenog recenzijskog postupka, nakon što uredništvo časopisa zaprimi rukopis i ocijeni da ima potencijal da bude objavljen, upućuje ga recenzentima – etabliranim autoritetima u konkretnoj oblasti i temi – kako bi potvrdili ili opovrgnuli inicijalnu ocjenu uredničkog tima ili urednika/urednice, te elaborirali svoje stručno mišljenje o konkretnom znanstvenom tekstu koji pretendira da bude objavljen. Tri su moguća ishoda procesa recenziranja: članak može biti odbijen, može biti preporučen za objavljivanje uz određene preinake i korekcije, ili, što je vrlo rijedak slučaj, može biti prihvaćen u cijelosti i bez korekcija.

Osim što stručna recenzija ima direktan učinak na sam status članka, postupak recenziranja je iznimno važan i za status časopisa. Naime, u posljednjih petnaestak godina recenzija je postala jedan od temeljnih kriterija u postupku validacije znanstvenih časopisa i njihovog uključivanja u komercijalne bibliografske baze podataka kao što su Scopus ili Web of Science Core Collection, a koje se sve češće, posebice u lokalnom akademskom kontekstu, nekritički tretiraju kao neutralan i znanstveno pouzdan instrument mjerenja akademske izvrsnosti i vrijednosti znanstvenog rada.¹

¹ Po mišljenju Saše Madackog, u takvoj logici vrednovanja zanemaruje se to da su u indeksiranim časopisima pojedinačni članici in-

1. Introduction

Within the complex system of academic publishing, peer review is one of the key steps in the process of publishing scientific papers. Moreover, some authors emphasize that the essence of a professional journal lies in the commitment, ethics and precision of peer-reviewed papers (cf. Pearson 2023; Petrișor, 2020). While the review process for monographs is somewhat different, the general procedure—or workflow—regarding scientific articles typically entails authors submitting their manuscripts to scientific and/or professional journals in the hope that they will be published. In the case of a closed review process, once the editorial board of the journal receives the manuscript and determines that it has the potential to be published, it is forwarded to the reviewers—established authorities in the specific field and topic—to confirm or reject the initial assessment of the editorial team or editor, and to provide a detailed expert evaluation of the scientific text intended for publication. There are three possible outcomes of the review process: the article may be rejected, it may be recommended for publication with certain modifications and corrections, or, which is a very rare case, it may be accepted in its entirety and without corrections.

Apart from the fact that peer review has a direct impact on the status of the article itself, the review process is also extremely important for the status of the journal. Namely, in the last fifteen years, peer review has become one of the fundamental criteria in the process of validating scientific journals and their inclusion in commercial bibliographic databases such as Scopus or Web of Science Core Collection, which are increasingly, especially in the local academic context, uncritically treated as a neutral and scientifically reliable instrument for measuring academic excellence and the value of scientific work.¹

¹ As noted by Saša Madacki, such evaluation logic ignores the fact that in indexed journals individual members are indexed by definition and that this fact should not be treated as a sufficient indicator

U svjetlu recentnih trendova koji ukazuju na ozbiljnu krizu ukupnog sustava stručnog recenziranja u akademskim časopisima na globalnom planu, ovaj rad se bavi kompleksnom problematikom procesa recenzije fokusirajući se na ulogu i poziciju recenzenta/recenzentica i, općenito, postupka recenziranja u časopisima iz područja humanističkih znanosti u bosanskohercegovačkom akademskom kontekstu. Ne treba posebno naglašavati da je riječ o veoma važnoj temi jer, s jedne strane, pozitivna stručna recenzija ključni je faktor u procesu objavljivanja znanstvenog rada, koji je, pak, uvjet akademskog napredovanja i statusa. S druge strane, sam postupak recenziranja jedan je od istaknutih kriterija indeksiranja časopisa u priznatim komercijalnim bazama.

U radu se najprije pojašnjava koncept i smisao akademskog recenziranja. U tom kontekstu, nudi se i osvrt na tradicionalne probleme i nedostatke sustava zatvorenog recenzijskog postupka te na nove izazove i tzv. krizu recenzije i recenziranja o kojoj se uveliko piše posljednjih godina. Potom se ukazuje na ključne specifičnosti bh. konteksta u ovom domenu te navode metodološke napomene vezane za istraživanje. Na osnovu analize i interpretacije podataka prikupljenih iz polustrukturiranih intervjuva obavljenih putem elektroničke pošte s odabranim urednicima i urednicama znanstvenih i stručnih časopisa iz oblasti humanističkih znanosti s prostora Bosne i Hercegovine, u centralnom dijelu rada nudi se prikaz situacije u BiH u svjetlu generalnih problema i izazova u sustavu akademskog recenziranja. Zaključni dio rada nastoji naglasiti ključne aspekte problema recenziranja akademskih radova u polju humanističkih znanosti u BiH.

2. Koncepti i izazovi stručne recenzije

2.1. Funkcija i kriza stručne recenzije

Proces recenzije kakvu danas poznajemo, barem kada je riječ o zapadnom akademskom izdavaštvu, nema dugu povijesnu tradiciju. Iako je, kako se navodi u nekim izvorima, časopis *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society* uveo stručne recenzije članaka već prilikom objavljivanja prvog broja 1665. godine (usp. Lovejoy et al. 2011; Diz-

Considering the recent trends highlighting a considerable crisis in the overall peer review system operating within academic journals worldwide, this paper addresses the complex issues surrounding peer review, with a focus on the role and position of reviewers and, more generally, on the peer review procedures in journals of the humanities in the academic context of Bosnia and Herzegovina. This topic is undoubtedly of great importance because, on the one hand, positive peer review is a key factor in the process of publishing a scientific paper, which is, in turn, a requirement for academic advancement and status. On the other hand, the peer review process itself is one of the prominent criteria for indexing journals in recognized commercial databases.

The paper first clarifies the concept and meaning of academic peer review. Within this context, consideration is also given to the traditional problems and shortcomings of the closed peer review process system, as well as new challenges and the so-called peer review crisis, as extensively covered in the literature over the recent years. The paper then points out the key specificities of the Bosnian context in this domain, and provides methodological notes related to the research. Drawing on the analysis and interpretation of data gathered from semi-structured interviews conducted via e-mail with selected editors of scientific and professional journals in the field of humanities from Bosnia and Herzegovina, the central part of the paper offers an overview of the situation in B&H considering the general problems and challenges in the academic peer review system. The conclusion of the paper highlights key aspects of the problem of peer review of academic works in the field of humanities in B&H.

2. Concept and challenges of peer review

2.1. The function and crisis of peer review

The peer review process in its present form, at least when it comes to Western academic publishing, does not have a long historical tradition. Although, as stated in some sources, the journal *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society* introduced expert review of articles with the launch of the first issue published in 1665 (cf. Lovejoy et al. 2011; Dizdar 2019, cit. according to Petrișor, 2020: 183), and from the 18th century the peer-review process began to be experimented with, it only became a standard segment of scientific publishing in the second

deksirani po definiciji i da se ta činjenica ne bi trebala tretirati kao dovoljan pokazatelj kvaliteta objavljenog članka. Madacki navodi znakovit podatak – da u periodu od 1900. do 2005. godine, od 38 miliona članaka iz Web of Science, njih 18 miliona nije citirano niti jedan put, preko tri miliona je citirano samo jednom, dok je samo 61 članak citiran više od 10.000 puta – na temelju kojeg zaključuje da “sam indikator gdje je nešto objavljeno ne može odgovoriti na pitanje šta je objavljeno, zašto je objavljeno i kakvog je kvaliteta, odnosno, kakvog je utjecaja imalo na naučnu zajednicu u cjelini” (2017, par. 8).

of the quality of the published article. Madacki cites a significant fact—that in the period from 1900 to 2005, out of 38 million articles in the Web of Science, 18 million of them were not cited even once, over three million were cited only once, while only 61 articles were cited more than 10,000 times—on the basis of which he concludes that „the indicator of where something was published alone cannot answer the question of what was published, why it was published and what quality it had, that is, what impact it had on the scientific community as a whole” (2017, par. 8).

dar 2019, nav. prema Petrișor, 2020: 183), a od 18. stoljeća se počelo eksperimentirati s recenzentskim postupkom, standardni segment znanstvenog izdavaštva postaje tek od druge polovine 20. stoljeća (usp. Stojanovski, 2024: 28-29). Tijekom stoljeća djelovanja akademskih časopisa prije toga, odluke o objavljivanju radova bile su u pravilu diskreciono pravo jedne osobe – urednika konkretne publikacije, koji je djelovao samostalno, eventualno uz neformalne savjete i sugestije koje je dobivao od kolega (usp. Rowland, 2002: 248).

Uvođenje recenzenata kao ključnih aktera u proces donošenja odluka vezanih za objavljivanje znanstvenih radova zasnovano je na važnim i utemeljenim argumentima. Recenzije prije svega funkcioniraju kao svojevrsni sustav “certificiranja”, i to u dva segmenta: “prihvatanje u časopis ili izdavačku kuću putem recenzije certificira sam rad, a također certificira i znanstvenika koji ga je proizveo” (Shatz, 2004: 1). Drugim riječima, recenzije djeluju kao sustav kontrole kvaliteta samog rada, nastojeći da se eliminiraju, ili barem minimiziraju, greške, propusti ili loše teze i argumenti u naučnim radovima. Istovremeno, promatrano iz perspektive autora/autorice, recenzije djeluju kao sustav validacije i svojevrsnog garanta stručnosti akademskih djelatnika/djelatnica, jer samo recenzirani radovi omogućavaju njihovo napredovanje i odgovarajući status. U tom smislu, akademske karijere su često izgrađene ili uništene kroz proces recenzije (usp. Shatz, 2004: 2). Pored recenzenata/ica i autora/ica, u samom recenzijskom procesu, izvanredno važnu upravljačku ulogu imaju urednici/urednice časopisa, koji/e posreduju “između znanstvenika-autora i znanstvenika-recenzenta” te “donose konačnu odluku o ishodu recenzijskog postupka” (Stojanovski, 2018: 81).

Terminološki i tehnički promatrano, recenzije u širem smislu obuhvaćaju i kritičko uredničko čitanje te inicijalnu procjenu akademskog rada, kao i ocjenu konkretnog znanstvenog djela koju provode recenzenti koji/e su eksperti/ekspertice u oblasti o kojoj je riječ. Jedina suštinska razlika je u tome što se anonimnost autora/autorica gotovo nikada ne može osigurati kada je riječ o čitanju i ocjeni pojedinačnih znanstvenih radova od strane urednika/ica publikacije (usp. Shatz, 2004: 8).

Iako je čitav sustav recenzija uspostavljen s ciljem da se eliminiira arbitrarnost i, u konačnici, unaprijedi kvaliteta znanstvenih radova, već dugo se govori i o problemima i izazovima u tom sustavu te mogućim reformama i alternativama. Problemi su dokumentirani naročito u oblasti prirodnih i medicinskih znanosti i odnose se na nedovoljnu pažnju koju

half of the 20th century (cf. Stojanovski 2024: 28-29). Over the centuries in which academic journals had been active before that, decisions regarding the publication of papers were typically the discretionary prerogative of a single individual—the editor of a specific publication, who acted independently, possibly with informal advice and suggestions received from colleagues (cf. Rowland 2002: 248).

Introducing reviewers as key actors in the decision-making process related to the publication of scientific papers is based on important and well-founded arguments. Reviewers primarily operate as a sort of the system of certification, in two segments: “acceptance by a journal or publishing house through reviews certifies a certain work, while at the same time certifying the academic who produced it” (Shatz, 2004: 1). In other words, reviews serve as a quality-control system for the work itself, trying to eliminate, or at least minimize, errors, omissions or weak theses and poor arguments in scientific papers. On the other hand, viewed from the perspective of the author, reviews act as a validation system and a kind of guarantor of the expertise of academics, because reviews function as a validation system and as a kind of guarantor of academic expertise, since only peer-reviewed papers enable scholars to advance and attain a certain academic status. In this sense, academic careers are often made or destroyed by the process of peer review (cf. Shatz, 2004: 2). In addition to reviewers and authors, journal editors play an exceptionally important managerial role in the peer-review process itself, acting as intermediaries “between the scientist-author and the scientist-reviewer” and they “make the final decision on the outcome of the review process” (Stojanovski, 2018: 81).

From both a terminological and a technical point of view, peer-review in a broader sense includes critical editorial reading and initial assessment of academic work, as well as evaluation of a specific scientific work by reviewers who are experts in the field in question. The only essential difference is that the anonymity of authors can almost never be ensured when it comes to reading and evaluating individual scientific papers by the publications’ editors. (cf. Shatz, 2004: 8)

Although the entire review system was established to eliminate arbitrariness and ultimately improve the quality of scientific papers, there has long been discussion about the problems and challenges within this system, as well as potential reforms and alternatives. The problems have been documented especially in the field of natural and medical sciences, and relate to the insufficient attention that reviewers pay to the papers they review, which sometimes results in major or minor errors and omissions in the published papers; the different treatment of authors depending on the institutions they come from

recenzenti/recenzentice posvećuju radovima koje recenziraju, što ponekad rezultira većim ili manjim greškama i propustima u objavljenim radovima; različit tretman autora/autorica s obzirom na institucije iz kojih dolaze (gdje se prednost daje znanstvenim radnicima/radnicama s prestižnih institucija); otpor recenzenata prema novim i inovativnim akademskim radovima itd. (usp. Shatz, 2004: 2).

Naročito su rasprostranjene optužbe koje ukazuju na raznovrsne predrasude recenzenata/recenzentica, a koje, kako se navodi, često onemogućavaju da se sagleda istinska vrijednost i kvaliteta znanstvenog rada (usp. Lee et al., 2013). Praksa dvostruke anonimizirane recenzije, u kojoj ni autor/ica ni recenzenti ne znaju identitet ni institucionalnu afilijaciju onog drugog, donekle ublažava problem pristrasnosti, ali njene mnogostruke dimenzije često idu i izvan samog pitanja autora/autorice i identiteta i tiču se politike, ideologije, rodnih uloga, znanstvenih stavova itd. Ukratko, kritičari/kritičarke tvrde da, iako je dobro osmišljen, tradicionalni sustav zatvorenog recenziranja u praksi pati od niza nedostataka. Oslanjajući se na studije Walker i Rocha da Silva (2015, prema Stojanovski, 2018: 81) i Ross-Hellauer (2017, prema Stojanovski, 2018: 81), kao najvažnije nedostatke zatvorenog recenzijskog postupka, Jadranka Stojanovski navodi sljedeće: usporavanje procesa objavljivanja publikacije, skupoća recenzijskog postupka, različite vrste pristrasnosti (poput pristrasnosti u odnosu na vrstu rada), nepouzdanost, odnosno visok stupanj neusklađenosti stajališta i komentara recenzenata o istom radu, nemogućnost otkrivanja pogrešaka i znanstvene nečestitosti, neetička praksa, izostanak poticaja i motivacije i rasipanje znanja i resursa (2018: 81-83; 2024: 30).

Važno je istaknuti da je kritički pristup akademske zajednice samom sustavu recenzija više zastupljen u prirodnim i društvenim znanostima nego u humanistici. Svakako je zanimljivo to da se u oblastima koje se bave kompleksnim pitanjima znanja, istine, etike itd. ne posvećuje značajnija pažnja problemu funkcioniranja formalnog sustava evaluacije, validacije i kriterija objavljivanja znanstvenih radova (Shatz, 2004: 8). Ipak, uočeni problemi u ovoj oblasti u drugim znanostima su najvećim dijelom relevantni i za područje humanistike.

S druge strane, debata o samom konceptu i praksi recenzije, iako još uvijek nedovoljno artikulirana, ostaje prilično polarizirana: na jednoj strani su pobornici/pobornice sustava, koji ga smatraju nepogrješivim, "zlatnim standardom", dok su na drugoj oni/one koji/e tvrde da je sustav već urušen, pa čak i uništen, i da su neophodne alternative (usp. Tennant & Ross-Hellauer, 2020).

(where priority is given to scientists from prestigious institutions); the resistance of reviewers towards new and innovative academic papers, etc. (cf. Shatz, 2004: 2).

Particularly widespread are accusations pointing to various biases on the part of reviewers, which, as is stated, often make it impossible to recognize the true value and quality of scientific work (cf. Lee et al., 2013). The practice of double anonymous review, in which neither the author nor the reviewers know the identity or institutional affiliation of the other, somewhat alleviates the problem of bias, but its manifold dimensions often go beyond the question of authorship and identity and concern politics, ideology, gender roles, scientific attitudes, etc. In brief, critics argue that, although well designed, the traditional system of closed review suffers from several shortcomings in practice. Relying on the studies of Walker and Rocha da Silva (2015) and Ross-Hellauer (2017), Jadranka Stojanovski notes the following most important shortcomings of the closed peer-review process: slowing down the publication process, the cost of the review process, various types of bias (such as bias in relation to the type of work), unreliability, that is, a high degree of inconsistency of the views and comments of reviewers on the same work, the inability to detect errors and scientific dishonesty, unethical practices, lack of incentives and motivation, and waste of knowledge and resources (2018: 81-83; 2024: 30).

It is important to emphasize that the critical approach of the academic community to the review system itself is more prevalent in the natural and social sciences than in the humanities. It is certainly interesting that in fields engaged in complex issues of knowledge, truth, ethics, etc., no significant attention is paid to the problem of the functioning of the formal system of evaluation, validation and criteria for publishing scientific papers (Shatz, 2004: 8). However, the problems observed in this area in other sciences are largely relevant to the field of humanities.

On the other hand, the debate on the concept and practice of review itself, although still insufficiently articulated, remains quite polarized: on one side are the supporters of the system, who regard it as infallible, the "golden standard", while on the other side are those who claim that the system has already collapsed, or even destroyed, and that alternatives are necessary (cf. Tennant & Ross-Hellauer, 2020).

At the same time, although the system of closed reviews seems to be a commonplace of the academic community where everything is known, scientific insights into its functioning and its key elements are relatively limited. For the purposes of this paper, it is sufficient to mention only a few aspects of the peer review process which still need to be explored

Istovremeno, iako se sustav zatvorenih recenzija čini kao opće mjesto akademske zajednice u kojem je sve poznato, znanstveni uvidi u njegovu funkcioniranje i njegove ključne elemente relativno su ograničeni. Za potrebe ovog rada dovoljno je navesti samo nekoliko aspekata procesa recenziranja koje tek treba detaljnije rasvijetliti. Prije svega, uloga urednika/urednice u odnosu na recenzente nije dovoljno razjašnjena, kao što često nisu jasni ni kriteriji ni argumenti na kojima se zasnivaju uredničke odluke o odbijanju ili objavljivanju akademskih radova. Pored toga, nisu sve dimenzije moguće povrede povjerljivosti² i pristrasnosti recenzenata dovoljno elaborirane, niti su uspostavljeni adekvatni mehanizmi koji će minimizirati taj problem. Neke ključne kategorije unutar sustava također nisu dovoljno precizirane, niti su adekvatno kritički sagledane. Tako, primjerice, nije sasvim jasno koji je to, zapravo, idealni, ili barem optimalni, profil recenzenta. Ko su to kolege i kolegice (eng. *peers*) koji/e su pogodni/e za ulogu recenzenata te šta sve pojedine osobe čini ekspertima u konkretnim oblastima (usp. Petrișor, 2020: 186-187). Pored toga, ne postoji konsenzus niti standard o tome šta je to kvalitetna recenzija (Sizo et al., 2025). Na kraju, učinak i dodatna vrijednost recenzija nisu dovoljno istraženi na globalnom planu, pa ostaje uglavnom nejasno koji je prosječni doprinos recenzije kvaliteti objavljenih radova (usp. Tennant & Ross-Hellauer, 2020).

Posljednjih godina, međutim, dosta se govori o krizi ovog sustava, te o tendencijama koje ugrožavaju same njegove temelje. Prije svega, bilježi se smanjena spremnost i zainteresiranost pripadnika akademske i ekspertske zajednice da čitaju i kritički evaluiraju radove koji pretendiraju na objavljivanje. Tako npr. urednik prestižnog pravnog časopisa *European Journal of International Law* svjedoči da u prosjeku svaki drugi potencijalni recenzent kojem se obrate pristane da uradi recenziju. Pored toga, kako isti urednik navodi, i kvaliteta samih recenzija i nivo detalja koji nude su često upitni, jer se recenzenti često ne trude da ponude argumente ili detaljnije obrazloženje za svoju ocjenu konkretnog rada. Takve recenzije u konačnici nisu od pomoći, pa se urednici obraćaju novim potencijalnim recenzentima, što značajno produžava vrijeme do donošenja konačne odluke o objavljivanju akademskog rada (Weiler, 2012).

² Kako naglašava Ljiljana Vučković-Dekić: "Recenziranje je posao poverljive prirode – sve dok se ne objave, podaci iz rukopisa pripadaju samo i isključivo autoru. Prema tome, svaka zloupotreba saznanja do kojih se dolazi tokom recenziranja je veoma težak etički prekršaj, koji može biti i zakonski sankcionisan" (2013: 77).

in more depth. Primarily, the role of the editor in relation to reviewers is not sufficiently clarified, as is the case with the criteria and arguments on which editorial decisions on the rejection or publication of academic papers are based. In addition, all dimensions of possible breaches of confidentiality² and bias of reviewers have not been sufficiently elaborated, nor have adequate mechanisms been established to minimize this problem. Some key categories within the system are also not sufficiently specified, nor have they been adequately critically reviewed. For example, it is not entirely clear what is the ideal, or at least optimal, profile of a reviewer. Who among the peers are suitable for the role of reviewers, and what makes a person an expert in a specific field? (cf. Petrișor, 2020: 186-187) In addition, there is no consensus or standard as to what constitutes a quality review (Sizo et al., 2025). Finally, the effect and added value of reviews have not been sufficiently researched on a global scale, so the average contribution of reviews to the quality of published papers remains largely unclear (cf. Tennant & Ross-Hellauer, 2020).

In recent years, however, there has been a lot of talk about the crisis of this system, and about tendencies that threaten its very foundations. Above all, a reduced willingness and interest of members of the academic and expert community to read and critically evaluate works that are intended to be published is reported. Thus, for example, the editor-in-chief of a prestigious legal journal *European Journal of International Law* states that on average every other potential reviewer they approach agrees to provide a peer review. In addition, as the same editor states, both the quality of the reviews themselves and the level of detail they offer are often questionable, because the reviewers often do not make an effort to offer arguments or a more detailed explanation for their assessment of the specific work. In the end, such reviews prove to be of little use, so editors turn to new potential reviewers, which significantly increases the time until the final decision to publish an academic paper (Weiler, 2012).

If even prestigious journals face such problems, it can be reasonably assumed that in the case of other journals, the challenges of the review process are far more serious and numerous (see Petrișor, 2020: 183-187). In any case, this is a worrying global trend.³

² As Ljiljana Vučković-Dekić emphasizes: "Reviewing is a business of a confidential nature—until it is published, the data from the manuscript belong only and exclusively to the author. Therefore, any misuse of knowledge obtained during peer review is a very serious ethical violation, which can also be legally sanctioned." (2013: 77)

³ For example, the editor of an American academic journal states that, while in the recent past every third or fourth expert he contacted agreed to be a reviewer, now approximately every eighth accepts this task (cf. Flaherty, 2022).

Ako se čak i prestižni časopisi suočavaju s takvim problemima, može se s pravom pretpostaviti da su u slučaju ostalih časopisa izazovi procesa recenziranja daleko ozbiljniji i brojniji (vidjeti Petrišor, 2020: 183-187). U svakom slučaju, riječ je o zabrinjavajućem globalnom trendu.³

Premda je o razlozima i faktorima nezahvalno spekulirati, navedena kriza entuzijazma na strani samih recenzenata svakako je povezana i s promjenama u profilu i statusu akademskih djelatnika na globalnom planu. Činjenica je da je recenzentski rad u pravilu besplatan i da nema gotovo nikakav utjecaj na akademske karijere samih recenzenata. Očigledno je da osjećaj dužnosti ili pripadnosti akademskoj zajednici više nije dovoljan motiv da se prihvati često vrlo zahtjevan zadatak recenziranja akademskog rada. Suočeni s egzistencijalnim pritiscima, imperativima i sve strožim kriterijima napredovanja te vlastitim projektima i inicijativama kojima nastoje popuniti rupe i u akademskoj i u finansijskoj konstrukciji svog profesionalnog života, akademski djelatnici imaju sve manje vremena i energije za recenzentske zadatke. Njihovo rastuće odbijanje da sudjeluju u tom procesu dovodi u pitanje cjelokupni sustav, a posljedično i njihov status i napredovanje u akademskoj hijerarhiji.

Iako kriza recenzijskog procesa još uvijek nije rezultirala kolapsom sustava, dugoročna neravnoteža između sve većih zahtjeva za validacijom akademskog rada i priznanja putem recenzije, s jedne strane, te smanjenja raspoloživih resursa i angažmana recenzenata, s druge strane, neminovno će dovesti do ozbiljnih posljedica.

Pored prekarnog statusa i sve teže borbe za preživljavanje brojnog akademskog osoblja, drugi faktor je strukturalne prirode. Velike izdavačke korporacije, unatoč enormnim profitima, još uvijek oklijevaju da ponude alternative ili dodatnu motivaciju⁴ recenzentima (npr. u formi honorara). Pored toga, akademska izdavačka industrija na globalnom planu gotovo nekontrolirano raste, što konstantno povećava potrebu za recenzijama i recenzentima.⁵ Istovremeno, krug raspoloživih recenzenata se ne širi odgovarajućim tempom, značajnim dijelom i zbog rodnog jaza u tom domenu. Naime, nedavna studija

³ Tako npr. urednik jednog američkog akademskog časopisa navodi da, dok je u nedavnoj prošlosti svaki treći ili četvrti ekspert kojeg je kontaktirao pristao da bude recenzent, sada na to pristaje otprilike svaki osmi (usp. Flaherty, 2022).

⁴ U nekim istraživanjima (Patel, 2014; Tite & Schroter, 2007) ukazano je na problem da se recenzentima/icama ne priznaju zasluge za njihov važan, zahtjevan, odgovoran i neplaćen recenzentski angažman (nav. prema Stojanovski, 2018: 83).

⁵ Procjenjuje se da od 2013. godine broj radova koje naučni časopisi zaprimaju raste za 6,1 posto svake godine. (Checco et al., 2021: 2; usp. Petrišor, 2020: 184)

While speculating about the reasons and factors is inadvisable, the aforementioned crisis of enthusiasm on the part of reviewers themselves is certainly also related to changes in the profile and status of academics on a global scale. It is evident that the work of reviewers is typically unpaid and has little, if any, influence on the reviewers' own academic careers. It is obvious that a sense of duty or belonging to the academic community is no longer a sufficient motive to accept the often very demanding task of reviewing academic work. Faced with existential pressures, imperatives, and increasingly stringent criteria for advancement, as well as their own projects and initiatives aimed at filling gaps in both the academic and financial structure of their professional lives, academics have less time and energy for review tasks. Their growing refusal to participate in this process undermines the entire system, and consequently their status and advancement in the academic hierarchy.

Although the crisis in the review process has not yet resulted in the collapse of the system, the long-term imbalance between the increasing demands for validation of academic work and recognition through review, on the one hand, and the reduction in available resources and engagement of reviewers, on the other hand, will inevitably lead to serious consequences.

In addition to the precarious status and the increasingly difficult struggle for survival of a considerable number of academic staff, the second factor is of a structural nature. Large publishing corporations, despite enormous profits, are still hesitant to offer alternatives or additional motivation⁴ to reviewers (e.g. in the form of honoraria). In addition, the global academic publishing industry is expanding at an almost uncontrollable rate, which constantly increases the need for reviews and reviewers.⁵ At the same time, the pool of available reviewers is not growing at a suitable rate, in large part due to the gender gap in this field. For example, a recent study focused on journals in the field of biomedical sciences showed that women make up less than a third of the reviewers of these journals. (cf. Goodman, 2022). Research also shows that the roles of reviewers are not evenly distributed within the academic community, with only 20 percent of scientific workers responsible for 94 percent of the reviewed papers (cf. Kovanis et al., 2016). This implies that the large majority of scientists in various fields do not contribute at all to the functioning of the review

⁴ Some researchers (Patel, 2014; Tite & Schroter, 2007) point out the problem that reviewers' significant, challenging, responsible, and unpaid review engagement go unacknowledged (cited in Stojanovski, 2018: 83).

⁵ It is estimated that since 2013, the number of papers received by scientific journals has been growing by 6.1 percent each year (Checco et al., 2021: 2; cf. Petrišor, 2020: 184).

fokusirana na časopise iz domena biomedicinskih znanosti pokazala je da žene čine manje od trećine recenzenata tih časopisa (usp. Goodman, 2022). Istraživanja pokazuju i to da uloge recenzenata nisu ravnomjerno distribuirane unutar akademske zajednice, pri čemu je samo 20 posto znanstvenih djelatnika odgovorno za 94 posto recenziranih radova (usp. Kovanis et al., 2016). To znači da ogromna većina znanstvenika/znanstvenica u različitim oblastima uopće ne doprinosi funkcioniranju sustava recenzija. Takav debalans u angažmanu na ovom polju neminovno dovodi do fenomena koji je nazvan *zamor recenzenata* (engl. *reviewer fatigue*), a koji podrazumijeva da akademski djelatnici odbijaju da prihvate recenziranje radova zbog toga što su previše zauzeti ne samo poslom i profesionalnim angažmanom općenito već i radom na drugim recenzijama (Breuning et al., 2015: 598).

2.2. Specifičnosti bosanskohercegovačkog konteksta

Općenito govoreći, navedeni problemi i izazovi s kojima se suočava validacija, objavljivanje i komunikacija znanstvenih radova u aktualnim okolnostima, imaju svoj odjek i u Bosni i Hercegovini. Naravno, obim i značaj krize u tom domenu nužno su proporcionalni veličini akademske i ekspertske zajednice u BiH, odnosno akademskoj izdavačkoj industriji, koja je relativno skromna.

U nastavku ovog rada fokus je stavljen na probleme u domenu recenziranja iz perspektive akademskih časopisa iz humanističkih znanosti u BiH.⁶ Takav fokus uvjetovan je praktičnim razlozima i profilom autorice ovog rada, ali i potrebom da se upravo ove znanosti uključe u širu diskusiju o kompleksnoj problematici akademskog recenziranja, s obzirom na to da je, kako je već navedeno, njihov glas u toj velikoj debati na globalnom planu prilično marginalan i marginaliziran u korist drugih znanosti. To, naravno, nužno ne znači da uvidi proizašli iz takvog fokusa nisu relevantni i za akademske časopise iz drugih znanstvenih disciplina u BiH, odnosno za problematiku akademske recenzije općenito.

S obzirom na njihovo djelovanje i način rada, navedeni časopisi su ujedno i nosioci akademske produkcije znanja u polju humanistike u BiH te ključne platforme za ispunjavanje kriterija i osiguravanje napredovanja u akademskim zvanjima u ovim obla-

system. Such an imbalance in engagement in this field inevitably leads to a phenomenon called *reviewer fatigue*, which implies that academic staff refuse to accept peer review duties because they are too busy not only with their work and professional engagement in general, but also with work on other reviews (Breuning et al., 2015: 598).

2.2. Specificities of the Bosnian-Herzegovinian context

In general, the aforementioned problems and challenges related to the validation, publication and communication of scientific works in current circumstances also resonate in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Clearly, the extent and impact of the crisis in this domain are inevitably proportional to the size of the academic and expert community in BiH, that is, the academic publishing industry, which remains relatively modest.

In the following sections of this paper, the focus is placed on problems in the field of peer review from the perspective of academic journals in the humanities in Bosnia and Herzegovina.⁶ Such a focus is dictated by practical reasons and the profile of the author of this present work, but also by the need to include these sciences in wider discussion on the complex issue of academic peer review, given that, as already stated, their voice in this great debate on a global level is rather marginal and marginalized in favor of other sciences. This does not, however, necessarily mean that the insights derived from such a focus are not relevant for academic journals from other scientific disciplines in BiH, that is, for the issue of academic review in general.

Considering their activities and the way they operate, the mentioned journals are also the bearers of academic production of knowledge in the field of humanities in Bosnia and Herzegovina, and key platforms for meeting the criteria and ensuring advancement in academic ranks in these fields. Namely, all current laws on higher education in B&H (at the level of Republic of Srpska and at the level of cantons in Federation of B&H), with some difference in the level of detail, prescribe the publication of peer-reviewed academic papers in publications that are indexed in relevant international databases as the principal criterion for promotion to senior associate and all academic faculty ranks.⁷

⁶ Prema dostupnim podacima, koji nisu potpuni ni sistematični, u BiH je identificirano 28 časopisa iz polja humanističkih znanosti koji na svojim web-stranicama navode da članci koje objavljuju prolaze kroz postupak dvostruko slijepe recenzije (tzv. *double blind peer review*) ili višestruke recenzije. Popis časopisa je dat u Prilogu 1.

⁶ According to the available data, which are neither complete nor systematic, 28 humanities journals have been identified in Bosnia and Herzegovina that state on their websites that the articles they publish go through a double-blind peer-review process or multiple reviews. The list of journals is provided in Appendix 1.

⁷ See, for example, the Law on Higher Education of the Republic of Srpska, Art. 80–86; Law on Higher Education of Sarajevo Canton, Art. 112; Law on Higher Education of the Bosnian-Podrinje Canton, Art. 80–81; Law on Higher Education of Zenica-Doboj Canton, Art. 81–82; Law on Higher Education of the Western Herzegovina Can-

stima. Naime, svi aktualni zakoni o visokom obrazovanju u BiH (na nivou Republike Srpske te na nivou kantona u FBiH), uz manja ili veća odstupanja u nivou detalja, propisuju objavljivanje recenziranih akademskih radova u publikacijama koje su indeksirane u relevantnim međunarodnim bazama podataka kao ključni uvjet za imenovanje u viša saradnička i sva znanstveno-nastavna i nastavna akademska zvanja.⁷

Međutim, ni u jednom od zakona o visokom obrazovanju u BiH recenziranje akademskih radova nije navedeno kao kriterij u procesu napredovanja. Samo u Pravilniku o minimalnim uvjetima izbora u zvanja Sveučilišta u Mostaru, recenziranje radova u znanstvenim časopisima eksplicitno je navedeno kao uvjet za napredovanje u kontekstu akademskih zvanja.⁸

Situacija u nekim susjednim državama je donekle drugačija. U Hrvatskoj je recenziranje tri, odnosno pet članaka u znanstvenim ili stručnim časopisima ili zbornicima radova predviđeno kao kriterij u postupku izbora u zvanje docenta, odnosno viša znanstveno-nastavna zvanja.⁹ U Srbiji, premda nije propisan kao uvjet za izbor u akademska zvanja, status recenzenta je na izvjestan način dobio na značaju i priznanju uvođenjem *popisa recenzenata* koji se sačinjava i objavljuje na web-stranici Nacionalnog akreditacionog tijela, a na osnovu javnog poziva.¹⁰

3. Metodološki okvir istraživanja

Cilj ovog istraživanja je bio da ispita mišljenja, iskustva i stavove odabranih urednika/urednica znanstvenih časopisa iz oblasti humanistike u BiH o samom recenzentskom postupku, suradnji s recenzentima/icama, kvaliteti rada recenzenata, od-

However, none of the laws on higher education in B&H mentions peer review of academic papers as a criterion in the promotion process. Only in the Regulations on the minimum requirements and selection procedure for academic, artistic, and teaching faculty ranks at the University of Mostar, peer review of papers in scientific journals is explicitly mentioned as a condition for promotion in the context of academic ranks.⁸

The situation in some neighboring countries is somewhat different. In Croatia, reviewing three and five articles in scientific or professional journals or proceedings is stipulated as a criterion in the selection process for the title of assistant professor and higher scientific and teaching titles, respectively.⁹ In Serbia, although it is not prescribed as a condition for selection for academic titles, the status of reviewer has in a certain way gained importance and recognition with the introduction of a list of reviewers, which is compiled and published on the website of the National Accreditation Body, following a public call.¹⁰

3. Methodological framework of the research

The objective of this research was to examine the opinions, experiences and viewpoints of selected editors of scientific journals in the field of humanities in B&H on the review process itself, cooperation with reviewers, the quality of reviewers' work, that is, the quality of reviews, with a particular focus on identifying the challenges they face, as well as determining potential proposals for improving the procedure and raising awareness of the importance and significance of review work. It should be noted that studies focusing on the issue of peer review from the perspective of the humanities, as well as on the experiences of the editors of scientific journals in this field, are extremely rare, even on a global scale. A search of relevant academic databases for the purposes of this work resulted in only

⁷ Vidjeti npr. Zakon o visokom obrazovanju Republike Srpske, čl. 80–86; Zakon o visokom obrazovanju Kantona Sarajevo, čl. 112; Zakon o visokom obrazovanju Bosansko-podrinjskog kantona, čl. 80–81; Zakon o visokom obrazovanju Zeničko-dobojskog kantona, čl. 81–82; Zakon o visokom obrazovanju Zapadnohercegovačkog kantona, čl. 75–77.

⁸ Usp. Pravilnik o minimalnim uvjetima i postupku izbora u znanstveno-nastavna, umjetničko-nastavna i nastavna zvanja. (član 9, st. j). Pored ovog Pravilnika, i Zakon o visokom obrazovanju Kantona Sarajevo npr. navodi i recenziranje međunarodnih projekata ili međunarodnih naučnih radova ili monografija/knjiga na stranim jezicima, odnosno recenziju naučnih radova, knjiga i monografija (član 112, st. 3 b i c), kao neke od dodatnih kriterija za "posebno vrednovanje za dodatne oblasti prilikom izbora u akademska zvanja", a koji će se utvrditi statutom i općim aktom visokoškolske ustanove. Statut Univerziteta u Sarajevu, u članu 227, u suštini ponavlja relevantne odredbe Zakona. Međutim, uloga recenziranja naučnih radova u izboru u akademska zvanja u okviru ovog zakona nije ni dovoljno jasna ni dovoljno promovirana kao relevantan kriterij te se, kao takav, gubi među dvadesetak sličnih kriterija navedenih pod rubrikom "društveni doprinos".

⁹ Prema Odluci o nužnim uvjetima za ocjenu nastavne i znanstveno-stručne djelatnosti u postupku izbora u znanstvena i akademska zvanja (2017).

¹⁰ Lista je dostupna na <https://www.nat.rs/lista-recenzenata/>

ton, Art. 75–77.

⁸ Cf. Rulebook on the minimum requirements and selection procedure for academic, artistic, and teaching faculty ranks. (Article 9, paragraph j). In addition to this Rulebook, the Law on Higher Education of Sarajevo Canton also outlines, for example, the peer review of international projects or international scientific papers or monographs/books in foreign languages, as well as the peer review of scientific papers, books and monographs (Article 112, paragraph 3 b and c), as some of the additional criteria for "special evaluation for additional fields during selection for academic titles", which will be determined by the Statute and general act of the higher education institution. The Statute of the University of Sarajevo, in Article 227, essentially repeats the relevant provisions of the Law. However, the role of peer review of scientific papers in the selection of academic positions within the framework of this law is neither sufficiently clear nor adequately promoted as a relevant criterion, and as such is lost among the twenty similar criteria listed under the rubric "contribution to society".

⁹ According to the Decision on the necessary requirements for the evaluation of teaching and scientific-professional activity in the procedure for appointment to academic and research ranks (2017).

¹⁰ The list is available at: <https://www.nat.rs/lista-recenzenata/>

nosno kvaliteti recenzija, s posebnim fokusom na identificiranje izazova s kojima se suočavaju, kao i utvrđivanje eventualnih prijedloga za unapređenje postupka i jačanja svijesti o važnosti i značaju recenzentskog rada. Treba istaći da su radovi koji se fokusiraju na problematiku recenziranja iz perspektive humanističkih znanosti te na iskustva samih urednika/urednica znanstvenih časopisa iz te oblasti iznimno rijetki i na globalnom planu. Pretraživanje relevantnih akademskih baza za potrebe ovog rada rezultiralo je samo jednim tekstom koji ima sličan tematski i metodološki okvir, a koji je fokusiran na znatno uže pitanje preferencija urednika časopisa iz oblasti društvenih i humanističkih znanosti kada je riječ, s jedne strane, o standardnoj dvostrukoj slijepoj recenziji i otvorenoj recenziji, s druge strane (usp. Karhulahti & Backe, 2021).

S obzirom na cilj istraživanja i prirodu ove problematike, primijenjen je kvalitativni istraživački pristup jer omogućava dublje razumijevanje uredničkih perspektiva i konteksta rada u akademskom izdavaštvu u BiH. Najprije je obavljen pregled i analiza dostupne literature, s posebnim fokusom na one sekundarne izvore u BiH, regionu, ali i na globalnom planu, koji se bave krizom recenzija i recenziranja u kontekstu znanstvenih radova. Podaci u okviru primarnog istraživanja prikupljeni su korištenjem polustrukturiranih intervjua obavljenih putem elektroničke pošte¹¹ i baziranih na upitniku koji je sadržavao sedam ključnih pitanja. Pitanja su bila usmjerena na različite aspekte postupka recenziranja, uključujući: organizaciju i dinamiku procesa recenziranja, suradnju i iskustva s recenzentima (njihovu pouzdanost, učinkovitost), eventualne izazove vezane uz osiguravanje kvalitete i etičkih standarda i mogućnosti unapređenja postupka recenzije.¹² Istraživanje je provedeno na svrsishodnom uzorku od osam¹³ ispitanika/ispitanica, koji/e obnašaju (ili su obnašali) funkciju urednika/urednice u znanstvenim časopisima iz oblasti kulturologije, lingvistike, filologije, filozofije, povijesti i teologije koji se objavljuju u različitim znanstvenim i kulturnim institucijama u BiH, a ujedno su i članovi/članice akademske zajednice u zvanju viših naučnih saradnika/saradnica ili redovnih, odnosno vanrednih profesora/profesorica. Pored obuhvaća-

one research paper that has a similar thematic and methodological framework, and which focuses on the much narrower issue of preferences of editors of journals in the field of social sciences and humanities when it comes, on the one hand, to standard double-blind review and, on the other, to open review (cf. Karhulahti & Backe, 2021).

Given the aim of the study and the nature of this issue, a qualitative approach was applied, as it facilitates a deeper insight into editorial viewpoints and the professional context within the academic publishing in Bosnia and Herzegovina. First, a review and analysis of the available literature was conducted, with particular focus on secondary sources in B&H, the region, and globally, addressing the crisis of peer review in the context of scientific publications. For the primary research, data were gathered through semi-structured interviews conducted via e-mail¹¹ and based on a questionnaire that contained seven key questions. The questions were focused on various aspects of the review process, including organization and dynamics of the review process, cooperation and experiences with reviewers (their reliability, efficiency), possible challenges related to ensuring quality and ethical standards, and the options for improving the peer review process.¹² The research was conducted on a purposive sample of eight¹³ respondents, who hold (or have held) the position of editor in scientific journals in the fields of cultural studies, linguistics, philology, philosophy, history, and theology published by various scientific and cultural institutions in B&H, and are also members of the academic community in the title of senior research associate or full or associate professor. In addition to ensuring diversity in terms of humanities disciplines and editorial perspectives, the sample was also selected with the aim of achieving gender balance (four men and four women) and covering the largest university centers in B&H (Banja Luka, Mostar, Sarajevo, and Tuzla). Participants were provided with information about the objectives of the research, and their participation was voluntary, anonymous, and confidential, in accordance with ethical standards of scientific research. The obtained data were processed and interpreted using thematic analysis, with the aim of identifying patterns in the experiences of editors. Based on these insights, a brief description of the conditions and challenges of peer review process, as well as of

¹¹ Intervjui su obavljani u osmom mjesecu 2025. godine.

¹² Konkretnije govoreći, teme/pitanja koja su činili okvir intervjua su: 1. Iskustva s pronalaženjem i angažiranjem i recenzentima; 2. Trajanje procesa recenziranja; 3. Ključni izazovi u radu s recenzentima; 4. Kvalitet recenzentskih izvještaja; 5. Da li se može govoriti o krizi recenzija i recenziranja?; 6. Motiviranje i vrednovanje rada i doprinos recenzentima; 7. Prijedlozi unapređenja sistema recenziranja.

¹³ Inicijalno je odabrano deset urednika/ica kojima je poslan upitnik, no dva urednika nisu odgovorila na molbu za sudjelovanje u istraživanju.

¹¹ The interviews were conducted in August 2025.

¹² More specifically, the topics/questions that formed the framework of the interviews were: 1. Experiences with finding and engaging reviewers; 2. Duration of the review process; 3. Key challenges in working with reviewers; 4. Quality of reviewer reports; 5. Is there a crisis of reviews and peer review?; 6. Motivating and valuing the work and contributions of reviewers; 7. Suggestions for improving the peer review system.

¹³ Ten editors were initially selected to be sent a questionnaire; however, two did not reply to the request to take part in the research.

nja raznolikosti u smislu humanističkih disciplina i uredničkih perspektiva, uzorak je odabran i s ciljem postizanja rodnog balansa (četiri muškarca i četiri žene) te pokrivanja najvećih univerzitetskih centara u BiH (Banja Luka, Mostar, Sarajevo i Tuzla). Sudionicima/icama su prethodno pružene informacije o ciljevima istraživanja, a njihovo sudjelovanje bilo je dobrovoljno, anonimno i povjerljivo, u skladu s etičkim standardima znanstvenog istraživanja. Dobiveni podaci su obrađeni i interpretirani tematskom analizom, s ciljem prepoznavanja obrazaca u iskustvima urednika/urednica, na temelju kojih se u nastavku nudi kraći prikaz uvjeta u kojima se odvija postupak recenziranja u znanstvenim časopisima i izazova, ali i općeg tretmana recenzenata i statusa recenzije u BiH.

Ograničenja ovog istraživanja su uglavnom karakteristična za slične studije zasnovane na intervjuima, među kojima se ističu moguća subjektivnost sugovornika i dobiveni nalazi ne mogu se u potpunosti generalizirati. Ipak, gdje god je to bilo moguće, takvi uvidi su dodatno potkrijepljeni nalazima drugih studija i analiza, komparativnim rješenjima iz drugih zemalja te relevantnim informacijama koje se tiču struktura i uvjeta znanstvene produkcije u BiH.

4. Recenzija u bosanskohercegovačkom kontekstu: rezultati istraživanja

S obzirom na višestruki značaj recenziranih znanstvenih i stručnih časopisa u BiH, problemi u njegovom operativnom radu zahtijevaju posebnu pažnju. Perspektiva urednika i urednica nekih od časopisa iz oblasti društvenih i humanističkih znanosti u BiH ukazuje na to da problemi u domenu recenziranja s kojima se suočavaju u određenoj mjeri korespondiraju s onima koji su već identificirani na globalnom planu, ali otkriva i niz izazova koji su uvjetovani specifičnim kontekstom BiH.

4.1. Pronalaženje i angažiranje recenzenata/recenzentica

Kada je riječ o osiguravanju recenzija za akademske radove u bh. kontekstu, na temelju iskustava urednica i urednika iz BiH može se utvrditi da je proces pronalaženja i angažiranja recenzenata i recenzentica relativno težak. Oni koji vode precizniju statistiku u tom smislu navode da u prosjeku svaki drugi kontaktirani ekspert/ekspertica pristane da bude recenzent/ica. Relativno slab odaziv članova/članica akademske zajednice da sudjeluju u postupku recenzije jedna od urednica povezuje s općim uvjetima rada unutar akademske zajednice u BiH. Prema njenim riječima:

the general treatment of reviewers and the status of peer review in Bosnia and Herzegovina, is offered below.

This study's limitations are typical of comparable interview-based studies, notably the possible subjectivity of the participants and the limited generalizability of the results. However, wherever possible, such insights are additionally supported by the findings of other studies and analyses, comparative examples from other countries, and relevant information regarding the structures and conditions of scientific production in B&H.

4. Peer review in Bosnian-Herzegovinian context: research results

In view of the manifold importance of peer-reviewed scientific and professional journals in BiH, problems in their functioning require particular attention. Perspectives of editors of selected journals in the field of social sciences and humanities in B&H indicate that the problems in the area of peer review they face correspond to some extent with those already identified globally, but also reveal a range of challenges shaped by the specific context of B&H.

4.1. Finding and engaging reviewers

When it comes to ensuring peer review for academic papers in the B&H context, based on the experiences of editors from B&H, one can conclude that the process of finding and engaging reviewers is relatively difficult. Those who keep a more precise statistics in this regard report that, on average, every second expert contacted agrees to be a reviewer. One of the editors links the relatively weak response of members of the academic community to participate in the review process to the general working conditions within the academic community in B&H. As she states:

“In the academic community, which is exposed to bureaucratization, pressure to publish as much as possible regardless of the stage and completeness of the research, and the formal recognition and evaluation of only certain forms of scholarly activity (in a system that often recognizes neither editorial nor peer review work, as is the case at least in the Sarajevo Canton), and expectation that journals should be indexed rather than that their content should be improved, in a community, thus, deprived of the right to develop as a genuine community rather than as an administrative category, the work of editing journals and reviewing manuscripts has been reduced to a mere formality. Only with great struggle can it be maintained as a real value to be nurtured. In such a system,

“u akademskoj zajednici koja je izložena birokratizaciji, pritisku da se objavljuje što je moguće više bez obzira na zrelost i dovršenost istraživanja, formalnom priznavanju i vrednovanju samo nekih oblika naučne djelatnosti (u sistemu koji često ne prepoznaje ni urednički ni recenzentski rad, kao što je to slučaj barem u Kantonu Sarajevo) i očekivanju da se časopisi indeksiraju, a ne da se njihov sadržaj poboljšava, u zajednici, dakle, kojoj je oduzeto pravo da se gradi kao stvarna zajednica a ne kao administrativna kategorija, posao uređivanja časopisa i recenziranja radova sveden je na formalnost koju treba ispuniti, i samo se teškom mukom može održati kao stvarna vrijednost koju treba njegovati. U takvom sistemu je teško naći recenzente, jer svi su pod pritiskom da objavljuju i niko nema vremena da čita neobjavljene tekstove, posebno ako im taj trud neće biti formalno prepoznat.”

Nadalje, nekoliko urednika/urednica je istaknulo da na spremnost znanstvenika/ica da sudjeluju u procesu recenziranja, čini se, u određenoj mjeri utječu i faktori kakvi su spol i akademski status. Iz rodne perspektive promatrano, žene u prosjeku češće pristaju sudjelovati u postupku recenziranja, dok su, promatrano kroz akademski status, članovi/članice akademskog osoblja nižih zvanja skloniji prihvatanju recenzentskih zadataka. Redovni profesori/profesorice, prema iskustvu većine intervjuiranih urednika/urednica, znatno rjeđe prihvataju da budu recenzenti/ce, iako su, kako navodi jedan urednik, upravo oni “po svom naučnom znanju i iskustvu najkompetentniji da napišu recenziju”.

Prema mišljenju nekoliko urednika i urednica, činjenica da se u većini susjednih država govore međusobno razumljivi jezici može se smatrati prednošću u procesu identifikacije potencijalnih recenzentata i recenzentica. Neki od intervjuiranih urednika/urednica navode pozitivna iskustva upravo s kolegama/kolegicama iz Hrvatske, odnosno Srbije, koji/e gotovo u pravilu prihvataju da recenziraju članke. To se dobrim dijelom vjerovatno može pripisati i uvrštavanju recenziranja naučnih radova među eksplicitne kriterije za izbor u akademska zvanja, konkretno u Hrvatskoj.

S druge strane, iskustva s kolegama/kolegicama iz zemalja izvan našeg regiona nisu tako pozitivna. Prema statistici koju navodi jedan od intervjuiranih urednika, tek 20 posto molbi upućenih potencijalnim recenzentima u ostatku Evrope i svijeta ima pozitivan ishod. Jedna od intervjuiranih urednica navodi da se veoma rijetko i teško odlučuje da recenzente/recen-

it is hard to find reviewers, as everyone is under pressure to publish and no one has time to read unpublished manuscripts, especially if such efforts will not be formally recognized.”

Furthermore, several editors pointed out that factors such as gender and academic status seem to influence, to some extent, scientists’ willingness to participate in the peer review process. From a gender perspective, women are on average more likely to agree to participate in the review process, while from an academic perspective, lower-ranking academic staff are more likely to accept review assignments. Full professors, according to the experience of most of the editors interviewed, are significantly less likely to accept review assignments, although, as one editor states, they are “the most competent to write a review based on their scientific knowledge and experience.”

Several editors pointed out that the fact that mutually intelligible languages are spoken in the neighbouring countries can be an advantage when identifying potential reviewers. Some of the interviewed editors mention positive experiences with colleagues from Croatia and Serbia, who almost always accept to review papers. This can probably be largely attributed to the inclusion of peer review of scientific papers among the explicit criteria for appointment to academic posts, specifically in Croatia.

On the other hand, experiences with colleagues from countries outside our region are not so positive. According to the statistics cited by one of the interviewed editors, only 20 percent of requests sent to potential reviewers in the rest of Europe and the world have a positive outcome. One of the editors interviewed states that “it is very rare and difficult [for her] to decide to seek reviewers from the wider international scientific community, even for contributions in English, due to the different methodological and theoretical culture” which, as she assumes, would not show sufficient sensitivity to recognize the relevance of local topics.

The weaker response rate of reviewers outside the borders of our region should undoubtedly be treated as a significant problem because, among other things, in the opinion of the interviewed editors, the region of the former Yugoslavia is too small for certain specific scientific fields and specific research topics. For a number of topics, there are only a few relevant authorities in the entire region, and in such cases, it is extremely difficult to preserve the anonymity of both the authors and reviewers in the context of double-blind peer review, since they will likely know each other very well. Therefore, as some editors point out, some articles from specific, narrower disciplines end up not being published due to the inability to provide adequate reviews.

zenticice traži u široj međunarodnoj znanstvenoj zajednici, čak i za priloge na engleskom jeziku, a zbog “drugачije metodološke i teorijske kulture” koja, kako pretpostavlja, ne bi pokazala dovoljan senzibilitet za prepoznavanje relevantnosti lokalnih tema.

Slabiji odziv recenzenata/recenzentica izvan granica naše regije bez dileme treba tretirati kao značajan problem jer, pored ostalog, po mišljenju intervjuiranih urednika i urednica, prostor nekadašnje Jugoslavije je premali za određene specifične znanstvene oblasti, odnosno teme. Za jedan broj tema postoji samo nekoliko relevantnih autoriteta u cijelom regionu i u takvim slučajevima je iznimno teško sačuvati anonimnost i autora i recenzenata u kontekstu dvostruke slijepe recenzije, budući da se oni po prirodi stvari jako dobro poznaju. Stoga se dešava, kako neki urednici i urednice ističu, da pojedini prilozima iz specifičnih, užih disciplina, ne budu objavljeni usljed nemogućnosti osiguravanja adekvatnih recenzija.

4.2. Trajanje procesa recenziranja

Gotovo svi intervjuirani urednici/urednice navode mjesec dana kao rok za recenziranje članaka. Samo u jednom slučaju taj je rok nešto kraći – dvije do tri sedmice. Pored toga, po prirodi stvari, rok za konačnu ocjenu nakon dorade članka je u pravilu znatno kraći – sedam do deset dana. Imajući u vidu da autori/autorice u pravilu imaju dodatnih nekoliko sedmica do mjesec dana da dorade tekst nakon što dobiju komentare recenzenata/recenzentica, prosječni optimalni rok za recenziranje znanstvenih članaka iz polja humanistike u BiH, barem prema svjedočenjima intervjuiranih urednika/urednica, je oko dva i po do tri mjeseca. No recenziranje u bh. kontekstu često podrazumijeva poslovanje sa stalnim, manjim ili većim, prolongiranjem rokova. Jedan od urednika navodi ekstremni primjer u kojima je standardni rok za recenziranje od jednog mjeseca bio produžen na čitavu godinu.

4.3. Kvaliteta recenzentskih izvještaja i ključni izazovi u radu s recenzentima

Kvaliteta recenzija je dodatni izazov s kojim se urednici i urednice akademskih časopisa u BiH susreću. Unatoč izmjenama recenzentskih obrazaca, kojima se recenzenti nastoje dodatno angažirati, još uvijek su relativno česte pozitivne recenzije u kojima su sve rubrike označene s “DA”, bez ikakvog obrazloženja ili argumentacije. U takvim slučajevima urednici i urednice su prinuđeni da traže nove eksperte/ekspertice, što dodatno odugovlači i komplicira sam proces recenziranja.

4.2. Duration of the review process

Almost all interviewed editors report that the deadline for reviewing articles is set to one month. Only in one case is this deadline somewhat shorter—two to three weeks. In addition, and understandably, the deadline for final evaluation after revision of the article is generally much shorter—seven to ten days. Bearing in mind that the authors usually have an additional few weeks to a month to revise the paper after receiving the reviewers’ comments, the average optimal deadline for reviewing scientific articles in the field of humanities in B&H, at least according to the testimonies of the interviewed editors, is about two and a half to three months. However, peer review in the B&H context often implies constant, minor or major, extension of deadlines. One of the editors cites an extreme example where the standard review period of one month was extended to a whole year.

4.3. The quality of review reports and key challenges in working with reviewers

The quality of reviews is an additional challenge that editors of academic journals in Bosnia and Herzegovina face. Despite the changes in the review forms, which aim at engaging the reviewers further, positive reviews in which all sections are marked with “YES”, without any explanation or argumentation, are still relatively frequent. In such cases, editors are forced to look for new reviewers, which further delays and complicates the review process itself.

In addition, there is a certain difference in the approach of the reviewers, depending on the academic community they come from. Namely, the majority of editors point out that the largest number of reviews they receive are mostly of satisfactory quality. However, as one of the interviewed editors points out, the reviews that come from more developed academic environments, primarily from some university centers from Croatia, “are as a rule meticulous and analytically in-depth.”

The way in which individual editors sometimes treat potential and already engaged reviewers is also reported to be part of the problem. Some of the interviewed editors speak about this based on their experience as reviewers. Namely, the articles submitted to them for review sometimes, as they point out, do not meet even elementary scientific criteria. In such cases, in their opinion, the editors have clearly not fulfilled their key role as the first filter, or guarantor of minimum academic standards and quality, which can be attributed to editorial superficiality and negligence. The second, much more serious problem pointed out by two interviewees is the practice in which their expert opinion as reviewers was almost completely ignored, and the papers in question, despite serious objections, and even an unequivocal

Pored toga, uočava se i stanovita razlika u pristupu recenzenata, zavisno od akademske zajednice iz koje dolaze. Naime, većina urednika/urednica ističe da je najveći broj recenzija koje dobiju uglavnom zadovoljavajućeg kvaliteta. Ipak, kako ističe jedan od intervjuiranih urednika, recenzije koje pristižu iz razvijenijih akademskih sredina, u prvom redu nekih sveučilišnih centara iz Hrvatske, “su u pravilu minuciozne i analitički produbljene”.

Način na koji pojedini urednici/urednice ponekad tretiraju potencijalne, ali i već angažirane recenzente/recenzentice također je naveden kao dio problema. Neki od intervjuiranih urednika/urednica o tome govore na osnovu njihovih iskustava u svojstvu recenzenata. Naime, članci koji im se dostavljaju na recenziranje ponekad, kako ističu, ne ispunjavaju ni elementarne znanstvene kriterije. U takvim slučajevima, po njihovom sudu, urednici/urednice očigledno nisu obavili svoju ključnu ulogu prvog filtera, odnosno garanta minimuma akademskog standarda i kvaliteta te se mogu optužiti za uredničku površnost i nemar. Drugi, znatno ozbiljniji problem na koji su ukazala dva sugovornika, jeste praksa u kojoj se njihovo stručno mišljenje kao recenzenta/recenzentice gotovo potpuno ignoriralo te su predmetni radovi, unatoč ozbiljnim primjedbama, pa i nedvosmislenom negativnom sudu i ocjeni, bili objavljeni gotovo bez ikakvih korekcija. Takva negativna iskustva dodatno demotiviraju potencijalne recenzente/recenzentice, dok takve uredničke prakse nanose veliku štetu ne samo časopisima već i ugledu akademske zajednice u cjelini.

Još jedan bitan problem u ovom domenu direktno je vezan za same autore/autorice a koji/e upućuju radove na objavljivanje u znanstvenim časopisima. Unatoč višegodišnjoj praksi akademskih recenzija i recenziranja u BiH, još uvijek se dešava da je “autore i autorice... teško uvjeriti da recenzentske primjedbe nisu napad na njihovu ličnost, posebno ako im se žuri da tekst objave zbog nekog administrativnog roka”. Prema iskustvu jedne od intervjuiranih urednica, autori i autorice uglavnom odustaju u slučajevima kada recenzenti sugeriraju ozbiljnije intervencije, pravdajući takav stav nedostatkom vremena da obave potrebne dopune i korekcije. Sve to ukazuje na još uvijek nedovoljno razvijenu akademsku kulturu, u kojoj se i dalje uglavnom teži ispunjavanju formalnih kriterija za napredovanje, a ne unapređenju kvaliteta znanstvenog rada i širenju horizonata znanja.

negative judgment and assessment, were published almost without any corrections. Such negative experiences further demotivate potential reviewers, while such editorial practices cause great damage not only to journals but also to the reputation of the academic community as a whole.

Another important problem in this domain is directly related to the authors who submit papers for publication in scientific journals. Despite years of practice of academic review and peer review in B&H, it still happens that “authors (...) are difficult to convince that reviewer remarks are not an attack on their personality, especially if they are in a hurry to publish the text due to an administrative deadline.” According to the experience of one of the interviewed editors, authors generally give up in cases where reviewers suggest more serious interventions, justifying such an attitude by the lack of time to make the necessary additions and corrections. All this points to a still insufficiently developed academic culture, in which the main focus is still on fulfilling formal criteria for advancement, rather than improving the quality of scientific work and expanding the horizons of knowledge.

4.4. Is there a crisis of reviewing and peer review in B&H?

The answers of the interviewed editors provide a very broad picture and a whole range of perspectives when it comes to diagnosing a possible crisis of scientific peer review in B&H. None of the interviewees state that the publication of scientific journals in B&H takes place in optimal conditions and as a rule they cite several challenges they face. Only one editor explicitly states that, in her experience, there is no crisis and trends of weaker interest in reviewing scientific papers.

On the other hand, only two of the seven remaining editors interviewed see the crisis on the side of the reviewers themselves. In fact, most of the interviewees speak in this context of a much broader crisis, whether it is about the resources and material preconditions on the side of the scientific journals themselves, the hyperproduction of scientific journals and papers that does not correspond to real needs and capacities, or the general conditions and current level of development of the epistemological community in B&H. In this sense, it can be argued that the potential crisis of review is inseparable from the unfavorable general conditions of scientific activity in the B&H context.

4.5. Valuation and motivation of reviewers

The vast majority of the editors interviewed agree that the work of reviewers in the current circumstances in Bosnia and Herzegovina is not adequate-

4.4. Da li se može govoriti o krizi recenzija i recenziranja u BiH?

Odgovori intervjuiranih urednika/urednica daju veoma široku sliku i čitav spektar perspektiva kada je riječ o dijagnosticiranju moguće krize znanstvenog recenziranja u BiH. Nijedan od sugovornika/sugovornica ne navodi da se objavljivanje znanstvenih časopisa u BiH odvija u optimalnim uvjetima i u pravilu ističu niz izazova s kojima se suočavaju. Samo jedna urednica eksplicitno iznosi stav da se, prema njenom iskustvu, ne može govoriti o krizi i trendovima slabije zainteresiranosti za recenziranje znanstvenih radova.

S druge strane, samo dva od sedam preostalih intervjuiranih urednika/urednica krizu vide na strani samih recenzenata/recenzentica. Većina sugovornika/sugovornica, zapravo, u ovom kontekstu govori o znatno široj krizi, bilo da je riječ o resursima i materijalnim pretpostavkama samih znanstvenih časopisa, hiperprodukciji znanstvenih časopisa i radova koja ne odgovara realnim potrebama i mogućnostima, ili općim uvjetima i aktualnom stupnju razvoja epistemološke zajednice u BiH. U tom smislu, može se ustvrditi da je eventualna kriza recenziranja neodvojiva od uglavnom nepovoljnih općih uvjeta znanstvenog djelovanja u bh. kontekstu.

4.5. Vrednovanje i motiviranje recenzenata/recenzentica

Izrazita većina intervjuiranih urednika/urednica slaže se da rad recenzenata u aktualnim okolnostima u BiH nije na adekvatan način valoriziran. Samo jedan urednik smatra da bi akademska solidarnost i svojevršno priznanje za ekspertizu u određenoj znanstvenoj oblasti koje status recenzenta/ice podrazumijeva trebalo da budu dovoljna motivacija za recenziranje radova. Također, jedan urednik ističe da se na to pitanje ne može jednoznačno odgovoriti, s obzirom na to da su pojedini univerziteti, poput Sveučilišta u Mostaru, recenziranje znanstvenih radova utvrdili kao jedan od uvjeta za napredovanje u znanstveno-nastavnim zvanjima. No, kao što je već navedeno, to su još uvijek izolirani primjeri. Većina sugovornika/sugovornica je mišljenja da recenzentski rad u bh. kontekstu nije adekvatno vrednovan, odnosno da je, prema riječima jedne intervjuirane urednice, riječ o “gotovo dobrotvornom volonterskom radu koji je gotovo nevidljiv”.

ly valued. Only one editor believes that academic solidarity and a kind of recognition for expertise in a particular scientific field that the status of a reviewer implies should be a sufficient motivation for reviewing papers. One editor also points out that this question cannot be answered unambiguously, given that some universities, such as the University of Mostar, have established the review of scientific papers as one of the conditions for advancement in scientific and teaching positions. However, as already mentioned, these are still isolated examples. Most of the interviewees are of the opinion that the work of a reviewer in the context of Bosna and Herzegovina is not adequately valued, or that, in the words of one of the interviewed editors, it is “almost charitable volunteer work that is almost invisible.”

5. Possible improvements of the system of academic peer review

5.1. Global debates and trends

When it comes to proposals for reform on a global level, one can distinguish between those that seek to reform the existing system—by motivating reviewers, expanding the circle of reviewers, etc., and those that seek to supplement or replace it with alternative models of scientific validation. Such alternative models include, for example, open peer review, in which the identity of both authors and reviewers is not only public, but the reviews themselves are also transparently published¹⁴; post-publication review, or reviews before submission to a journal; or less restrictive forms of open publishing in which papers are published on online platforms, after which the relevance, innovation and significance of the paper itself are determined by readers, specifically, the wider scientific community (it is important to note that in the latter case there is a risk of an excessive number of published papers that are difficult to track, which would make it difficult to identify those that are truly worthy of academic attention); the use of artificial intelligence as an aid in the review process, especially when it comes to quantitative studies and statistical presentations; use of commercial companies that provide independent reviews; and interactive, collaborative review processes, in which editors and reviewers use digital tools to discuss and jointly make a decision on the publication of a specific paper (cf. Horbach & Halfman, 2018).

¹⁴ Open review includes different levels of transparency of the review process and different elements, from the publication of manuscripts, the identity of reviewers, as well as the reviews themselves, through the possibility of community participation in the review process, to the introduction of the possibility of commenting on published works. According to the proponents of this model, open peer review brings a whole range of advantages, such as speeding up the process, easier identification of academic dishonesty and plagiarism, and improvement and expansion of scientific discussion (cf. Stojanovski, 2024: 31). See more in Stojanovski (2018: 83-87).

5. Moguća unapređenja sustava akademske recenzije

5.1. Globalne debate i trendovi

Kada je riječ o prijedlozima reforme na globalnom planu, razlikujemo one koji nastoje reformirati postojeći sustav – motivirati recenzente/recenzentice, proširiti krug recenzenata itd. i one koji ga nastoje dopuniti ili zamijeniti alternativnim modelima znanstvene validacije. Takvi alternativni modeli su npr. otvorene recenzije (engl. *open peer review*), u kojem ne samo da je identitet i autora/autorice i recenzenata javan već se i same recenzije transparentno objavljuju;¹⁴ recenziranje nakon objavljivanja, ili recenzije prije slanja u časopis; ili manje restriktivne forme otvorenog objavljivanja u kojima se radovi objavljuju na online platformama, nakon čega relevantnost, inovativnost i značaj samog rada utvrđuju čitatelji/čitateljice, odnosno šira znanstvena zajednica (bitno je istaknuti da u ovom potonjem slučaju postoji rizik od prevelikog broja objavljenih radova koje je teško pratiti i identificirati one koji su zaista vrijedni akademske pozornosti); upotreba vještačke inteligencije kao pomoći u procesu recenziranja, naročito kada je riječ o kvantitativnim studijama i statističkim prikazima; korištenje komercijalnih kompanija koje osiguravaju nezavisne recenzije; te interaktivni, kolaborativni procesi recenziranja, u kojima urednici/urednice i recenzenti/recenzentice koriste digitalne alate kako bi diskutirali i zajednički donijeli odluku o objavljivanju konkretnog rada (usp. Horbach & Halffman, 2018). Sve su glasnjiji i oni koji sugeriraju da se restriktivna praksa recenziranja treba potpuno napustiti. No u tom slučaju se nužno nameće pitanje kako tretirati akademske radove koji su objavljeni bez recenzije. Neki autori sugeriraju svojevrsnu evaluaciju nakon objavljivanja, u smislu da se procjenjuje odjek i utjecaj koji je konkretno djelo imalo u određenoj oblasti, odnosno zajednici (usp. Shatz, 2004, poglavlje 5).

Ipak, iako je korištenje ovih novih metoda recenzije sve više rasprostranjeno, njihovi efekti u široj znanstvenoj zajednici tek treba da budu sistematski evaluirani (usp. Hellauer & Horbach, 2024). S druge strane, navedene promjene u tehnologiji recenziranja koje se već primjenjuju u nekim časopisima

There are also increasingly vocal proponents of the idea that the restrictive practice of peer review should be abandoned altogether. But in that case, the question of how to treat academic papers that have been published without peer review necessarily arises. Some authors suggest a kind of post-publication evaluation, in the sense of assessing the impact and influence that a specific work has had in a particular field or community (cf. Shatz, 2004, Ch. 5).

Although these new peer review methods are increasingly used, their effects in the wider scientific community have yet to be systematically evaluated (cf. Hellauer & Horbach, 2024). On the other hand, the mentioned changes in peer-review technology, which are already applied in some journals and publishing houses, have intensified old questions concerning the role and function of peer-reviews in scientific journals: should reviewers also evaluate the relevance, impact, and potential usefulness of a specific work for other scientists and researchers, or should they limit themselves only to the evaluation of consistency and methodological rigour (cf. Horbach & Halffman, 2018: 11). The trend of open science and a less restrictive approach to the publication of scientific and professional papers certainly suggests this latter approach.

It is important to point out that there is also a noticeable difference in innovative approaches to the review process between the natural sciences, on the one hand, and the social sciences and humanities, on the other, with the latter remaining mostly closed to such innovations for the time being. Therefore, calls for the opening of the humanities according towards new models and technologies for the validation of scientific research work, namely, for the introduction of open peer review in the context of “open humanities” (Knochelmann, 2019), are appearing with increasing frequency. At the same time, there is growing awareness of the specificity of research in the humanities, and the multidimensional nature of scientific works in that field, which makes them less receptive and more complex from the perspective of innovating the review process. Indeed, „the paradigms and methods (...) in the humanities (...) focus more on subjectivity and perspectivity than the objectivity, reproducibility, replicability, and generalizability” (Arthur & Hearn, 2021: 829) of other sciences, which makes the discussion about the advantages of open science significantly less relevant from the perspective of the humanities. Accordingly, the possible opening of the peer review process probably has less potential and less effect on resolving the overall peer review crisis in the humanities than in some other sciences. This is also supported by available research from other countries, which suggests that editors of scientific journals in the humanities

¹⁴ Otvorena recenzija može podrazumijevati različite razine transparentnosti recenzentskog procesa i različite elemente, od objavljivanja rukopisa, identiteta recenzenata, kao i samih recenzija, preko mogućnosti sudjelovanja zajednice u recenzijskom postupku, do uvođenja mogućnosti komentiranja objavljenih radova. Prema zagovornicima ovog modela, otvorena recenzija donosi čitav niz prednosti, kakve su ubrzavanje procesa, lakše utvrđivanje akademske nečestitosti i plagijarizma te unapređenje i proširivanje znanstvene diskusije (usp. Stojanovski, 2024: 31). O otvorenom recenzentskom postupku vidjeti više u Stojanovski (2018: 83-87).

i izdavačkim kućama intenzivirale su stara pitanja koja se tiču uloge i funkcije recenzija u znanstvenim časopisima: da li bi recenzenti trebalo da ocjenjuju i relevantnost, utjecaj i potencijalnu korisnost konkretnog rada za druge znanstvenike i istraživače, ili bi trebalo da se zadrže samo na ocjeni konzistentnosti i metodološke preciznosti (usp. Horbach & Halffman, 2018: 11). Trend otvorene znanosti i manje restriktivnog pristupa objavljivanju znanstvenih i stručnih radova svakako sugerira ovaj potonji pristup recenziranju.

Bitno je istaknuti i to da je primjetna i razlika u inovativnim pristupima procesu recenziranja između prirodnih znanosti s jedne, i društvenih i humanističkih znanosti, s druge strane, pri čemu ove potonje za sada uglavnom ostaju zatvorene za takve inovacije. Stoga se sve češće pojavljuju pozivi za otvaranje humanističkih znanosti prema novim modelima i tehnologijama validacije znanstvenoistraživačkog rada, odnosno za uvođenje otvorene recenzije u kontekstu “otvorene humanistike” (Knochelmann, 2019). Istovremeno, raste svijest i o specifičnosti istraživanja u humanističkim znanostima, te višedimenzionalnoj prirodi znanstvenih radova u toj oblasti, što ih čini manje prijemčivim i kompleksnijim iz perspektive inoviranja procesa recenzije. Zaista, za razliku od prirodnih ili tehničkih znanosti, “paradigme i metode (...) humanističkih znanosti (...) fokusiraju se više na subjektivnost i perspektivu, nego na objektivnost, reproduktivnost, replikabilnost i mogućnost generalizacije” (Arthur & Hearn, 2021: 829) ostalih znanosti, što raspravu o prednostima otvorene znanosti čini znatno manje relevantnom iz perspektive humanistike. U skladu s tim, i moguće otvaranje procesa recenzije ima vjerovatno manje potencijala i manje efekta na rješavanje ukupne krize recenziranja u humanistici u odnosu na neke druge znanosti. O tome govore i dostupna istraživanja iz drugih zemalja, koja sugeriraju da urednici znanstvenih časopisa iz oblasti humanističkih znanosti i dalje preferiraju standardnu, dvostruko slijepu recenziju, smatrajući je višestruko superiornom u odnosu na neke nove metode recenziranja (Karhulahti & Backe, 2021).

Na kraju, važno je istaknuti da većina prijedloga reforme sustava recenziranja zadržava značaj uloge recenzenata/recenzentica, što je naročito relevantno za humanističke znanosti. S tim u vezi, i kriza recenzije, u mjeri u kojoj se može svesti na taj ključni ljudski faktor, zahtijeva posebne mehanizme koji bi motivirali veći broj znanstvenika da sudjeluju u procesu recenziranja, ali i unaprijedili kvalitete i pouzdanost samih recenzija u uvjetima rastuće potrebe za takvim uslugama u akademskom izdavaštvu na globalnoj razini.

still prefer standard, double-blind peer review, considering it to be many times superior to some new peer review methods (Karhulahti & Backe, 2021).

Finally, it is important to point out that most proposals for reforming the peer review system retain the importance of the role of reviewers, which is particularly relevant for the humanities. In this regard, the peer review crisis, to the extent that it can be reduced to this crucial human factor, requires specific mechanisms that would not only motivate a greater number of scientists to participate in the peer review process, but also improve the quality and reliability of the reviews themselves in the context of the growing need for such services in academic publishing on a global level.

5.2. Proposals for reform of the peer review system in Bosnia and Herzegovina

Opportunities to improve practice in this area in B&H should first be sought within the institutional and structural context. Experiences from Croatia, including the experiences of the interviewed editors of academic journals from Bosnia and Herzegovina with reviewers from Croatia, indicate that legislation that would prescribe the review of scientific papers as an explicit condition for advancement in terms of academic positions can change the attitude towards peer review and the quality and seriousness of the reviews themselves. Another example from the region—the certified lists of reviewers in Serbia, which are compiled on the basis of a public call and a set of predefined criteria—certainly has positive elements and could also be considered in the B&H context as well. On the other hand, the experiences of some of the interviewed editors suggest that, given the specificities of the academic and scientific community in B&H, flexibility and freedom of choice on the part of editorial boards should still be favored, rather than additional bureaucratization of the entire process in the form of closed lists of reviewers, especially considering that in the current conditions, qualifications and expertise are mostly evident and easily verifiable.

In the context of the continuous devaluation of scientific work in B&H, it would certainly be worth considering additional ways in which reviewers could be motivated to perform peer review and write reviews of better quality. This additional motivation, as suggested by some of the interviewed editors, could include financial compensation. However, it is important to point out that, according to relevant international research, more professional recognition for their work is a key factor that could motivate scientists to accept the role of reviewers more often (cf. Flaherty, 2022). As additional ways of professional recognition of the work of review-

5.2. Prijedlozi reforme sustava recenziranja u bosanskohercegovačkom kontekstu

Prostor za unapređenje prakse u BiH u ovoj oblasti prije svega treba tražiti u domenu institucionalnih i strukturalnih uvjeta. Iskustva iz Hrvatske, pa i iskustva intervjuiranih urednika/urednica akademskih časopisa iz BiH s recenzentima i recenzenticama iz Hrvatske, ukazuju na to da zakonska regulativa koja bi recenziranje znanstvenih radova propisala kao eksplicitni uvjet za izbor u akademska zvanja može promijeniti i odnos prema recenziranju i kvalitete i ozbiljnost samih recenzija. Drugi primjer iz regiona, kakve su certificirane liste recenzenata u Srbiji, koje se sačinjavaju na osnovu javnog poziva i niza unaprijed utvrđenih kriterija, svakako ima pozitivne elemente i može se razmotriti i u bh. kontekstu. S druge strane, iskustva nekih od intervjuiranih urednika i urednica sugeriraju da bi, s obzirom na specifičnosti akademske i znanstvene zajednice u BiH, ipak trebalo favorizirati fleksibilnost i slobodu izbora na strani redakcija, a ne dodatnu birokratizaciju cijelog procesa u vidu zatvorenih lista recenzenata/recenzentica, naročito imajući u vidu da su u aktualnim uvjetima kvalifikacije i ekspertiza uglavnom evidentni i lako provjerljivi.

U kontekstu kontinuirane devalvacije znanstvenog rada u BiH, svakako bi vrijedilo razmotriti i dodatne načine na koje bi se recenzenti mogli motivirati da prihvate recenziranje i da pišu kvalitetnije recenzije. Ta dodatna motivacija, kako su sugerirali neki od intervjuiranih urednika/urednica, mogla bi uključivati i određenu finansijsku naknadu. No, važno je istaknuti da je, prema relevantnim međunarodnim istraživanjima, više profesionalnog priznanja za njihov rad ključni faktor koji bi znanstvenike/znanstvenice mogao motivirati da češće prihvaćaju ulogu recenzenata (usp. Flaherty, 2022). Kao dodatne načine profesionalnog priznanja recenzentskog rada neki od intervjuiranih urednika/ica su naveli objavljivanje popisa recenzenata/ica i izdavanja potvrda o recenzentskom angažmanu, što neki od časopisa u BiH već primjenjuju. Pored toga, kako ističe jedna od sugovornica, vrijedilo bi razmotriti i uvođenje dužih rokova za izradu recenzije, te intenzivirati angažman urednika/urednica znanstvenih časopisa, koji bi eliminirali veće propuste u samim tekstovima prije nego što ih pošalju na recenziju.

S obzirom na pozitivna iskustva intervjuiranih urednika i urednica s recenzentima iz država iz neposrednog okruženja, naročito onih s razvijenijom akademskom kulturom i dugom tradicijom objavljivanja akademskih časopisa, svakako bi bilo korisno na sistematičan način raditi na uspostavljanju i produblji-

ers, some of the interviewed editors suggested publishing a list of reviewers and issuing certificates of reviewer engagement, which some journals in B&H already practice. In addition, as one of the interviewees points out, it would be worth considering introducing longer deadlines for writing reviews, and intensifying the engagement of editors of scientific journals, who would eliminate major omissions in the papers themselves before sending them for review.

Considering the positive experiences of the interviewed editors with reviewers from neighboring countries, especially those with a more developed academic culture and a long tradition of publishing academic journals, it would certainly be useful to systematically work on establishing and deepening such international connections and exchanging experiences and knowledge in the field of academic peer review with editors and colleagues from such environments. Furthermore, additional education and training of editors, organization of peer review workshops, and responsible use of artificial intelligence can also help in facing the growing challenges in the field of academic peer review (cf. Stojanovski, 2024: 31). In addition, some elements of open peer review, elaborated in the previous part of this paper, also have the potential to contribute to the survival and improvement of academic peer review in B&H as well.

6. Concluding considerations

The crisis of academic peer review is a current global problem that has reflections in B&H. Similar and increasingly pronounced problems related to finding a sufficient number of qualified and enthusiastic reviewers and ensuring the necessary quality of reviews are mostly observed in the B&H context as well. Nonetheless, the experiences of the interviewed editors of academic journals from B&H indicate that there are serious problems in terms of material conditions, but also at the level of the academic community and culture in BiH, where scientific communication, exchange of arguments and awareness of active participation in the peer review process as an important contribution to the common project of raising academic criteria, is still not at the required level.

In such a context, it one can rightly ask whether the academic peer review system in B&H has even come to life to the level at which we could speak of its crisis, which would correspond to global trends in this domain. However, since there are various initiatives on the global level that seek to improve the overall academic review system, which are also presented to some extent in this paper, relevant stakeholders in B&H should strive to follow these trends.

vanju takvih međunarodnih veza i razmjeni iskustava i znanja u domenu akademskog recenziranja sa urednicima/urednicama i kolegama/kolegicama iz takvih sredina. Nadalje, dodatna edukacija i obučavanje urednika/ca, organiziranje recenzentskih radionica, te odgovorno korištenje vještačke inteligencije, također mogu pomoći u suočavanju sa rastućim izazovima u domenu akademskog recenziranja (usp. Stojanovski, 2024: 31). Pored toga, i neki elementi otvorene recenzije, elaborirani u prethodnom dijelu ovog rada, također imaju potencijal da doprinesu očuvanju i unapređenju akademskog recenziranja i u BiH.

6. Zaključna razmatranja

Kriza akademskih recenzija i recenziranja je aktualni globalni problem koji ima svoje refleksije i u BiH. Slični i sve izraženiji problemi vezani za pronalaženje dovoljnog broja kvalificiranih i entuzijastičnih recenzenata, te osiguravanje potrebnog kvaliteta recenzija uglavnom se uočavaju i u bh. kontekstu. No iskustva intervjuiranih urednika i urednica akademskih časopisa iz BiH ukazuju na to da postoje i ozbiljni problemi u smislu materijalnih uvjeta, ali i na nivou akademske zajednice i kulture u BiH, u kojoj znanstvena komunikacija, razmjena argumenata i svijest o aktivnom učešću u procesu recenziranja kao bitnom doprinosu zajedničkom projektu podizanja akademskih kriterija, još uvijek nije na potrebnom nivou.

U takvom kontekstu opravdano je postaviti i pitanje je li sustav akademskog recenziranja u BiH uopće zaživio do nivoa na kojem bismo mogli govoriti o njegovoj krizi koja bi korespondirala s globalnim trendovima u ovom domenu. Ipak, budući da na globalnom planu postoji niz inicijativa koje nastoje da unaprijede ukupni sustav akademskog recenziranja, a koje su donekle prezentirane i u ovom radu, relevantni akteri u BiH treba da nastoje da prate te trendove.

Naravno, kvaliteta akademskih recenzija je u direktnoj korelaciji s kvalitetom znanstvene i akademske zajednice o kojoj je riječ. U tom smislu, u kontekstu BiH, u kojem se akademski časopisi često grčevito bore za redovno i kontinuirano izlaženje, teško je očekivati da sam proces akademskog recenziranja bude znatno bolji ili kvalitetniji od njegovih ishoda, odnosno same akademske produkcije. No, imajući u vidu značaj i potencijal procesa recenziranja, upravo bi njegovo unapređenje, uz puno razumijevanje slabosti konteksta i značaja i uloge svih ključnih aktera, bio odlučni korak ka suštinskom podizanju kvaliteta znanstvene produkcije i zajednice u BiH – jedan po jedan akademski tekst.

It is well established that the quality of academic peer review is directly correlated with the quality of the scientific and academic community in question. In this sense, in the context of Bosnia and Herzegovina, where academic journals often struggle anxiously to maintain regular and continuous publication, it is difficult to expect that the process of academic review itself will be significantly better or of higher quality than its outcomes, that is, the academic production itself. However, bearing in mind the importance and potential of the review process, it is precisely its improvement, with a full understanding of the contextual challenges and the importance and role of all key actors, that would present a decisive step towards substantially improving the quality of scientific production and the community in B&H—one academic paper at a time.

Bibliografija / Bibliography

- Arthur, L. P., & Hearn, L. (2021). Toward open research: A narrative review of the challenges and opportunities for open humanities. *Journal of Communication* 71(5), 827-853.
- Breuning, M., Backstrom, J., Brannon, J., Gross, B. I., & Widmeier, M. (2015). Reviewer fatigue? Why scholars decline to review their peers' work. *PS: Political Science & Politics* 48(4), 595-600.
- Checco, A., Bracciale, L., Loreti, P., Pinfield, S., & Bianchi, G. (2021). AI-assisted peer review. *Humanities and social sciences communications* 8(1), 1-11.
- Flaherty, C. (2022). The Peer-Review Crisis. *Inside Higher Ed*, 12. 6. 2022. <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2022/06/13/peer-review-crisis-creates-problems-journals-and-scholars>
- Goodman, S. (2022) How Gender Bias Worsened the Peer-Review Crisis. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 15. 12. 2022. <https://www.chronicle.com/article/how-gender-bias-worsened-the-peer-review-crisis> [2. 6. 2025]
- Horbach, S. P., & Halfman, W. (2018). The changing forms and expectations of peer review. *Research Integrity and Peer Review* 3(1), 8. doi: 10.1186/s41073-018-0058-y.
- Karhulahti, V. M., & Backe, H. J. (2021). Transparency of peer review: a semi-structured interview study with chief editors from social sciences and humanities. *Research Integrity and Peer Review* 6, 13. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41073-021-00116-4>
- Knöchelmann, M. (2019). Open science in the humanities, or Open humanities? *Publications* 7(4), 65. <https://doi.org/10.3390/publications7040065>
- Kovanis, M., Porcher, R., Ravaud, P., & Trinquart, L. (2016). The global burden of journal peer review in the biomedical literature: Strong imbalance in the collective enterprise. *PloS one* 11(11). <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0166387>
- Lee, C. J., Sugimoto, C. R., Zhang, G., & Cronin, B. (2013). Bias in peer review. *Journal of the American Society for information Science and Technology* 64(1), 2-17.
- Madacki, S. (2017). Kako procijeniti vrijednost naučno-istraživačkog rada? *Policyhub*, 6. 2. 2017. <https://policyhub.analitika.ba/bs/politike-i-standardi/170> [29. 6. 2025]
- Pearson, G. S. (2023). The ongoing importance of peer review. *Journal of the American Psychiatric Nurses Association* 29(6), 445-446. doi:10.1177/10783903231205311
- Petrișor, A. I. (2020). Peer review under the ethical lens: possible questions, *Bosniaca* 25(25), 183-197.
- Rowland, F. (2002). The peer-review process. *Learned publishing*, 15(4), 247-258.
- Ross-Hellauer, T., & Horbach, S. P. J. M. (2024). Additional experiments required: A scoping review of recent evidence on key aspects of Open Peer Review. *Research Evaluation* 33. <https://doi.org/10.1093/reseval/rvae004>
- Shatz, D. (2004). *Peer review: A critical inquiry*. Lanham MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Sizo, A., Lino, A., Rocha, A., & Reis, L. P. (2025). Defining quality in peer review reports: a scoping review. *Knowledge and Information Systems* 67, 6413-6460. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10115-025-02435-0>
- Stojanovski, J. (2024). Crtice o znanosti, znanstvenoj komunikaciji i znanstvenom izdavaštvu. *Medicina Fluminensis* 60(Supplement 1), 23-33.
- Stojanovski, J. (2018). Otvoreni recenzijski postupak. In: Grgić Hebrang, I. (Ed.) *Otvorenost u znanosti i visokom obrazovanju* (pp. 80-92). Zagreb: Školska knjiga. https://fulir.irb.hr/4180/1/959161.Jadranka_poglavlje.pdf
- Sveučilište u Mostaru. (2020) Pravilnik o minimalnim uvjetima i postupku izbora u znanstveno-nastavna, umjetničko-nastavna i nastavna zvanja. https://webadmin.sum.ba/api/storage/Pravilnik%20o%20min_1595831506_51.pdf [25. 7. 2025]
- Tennant, J. P., & Ross-Hellauer, T. (2020). The limitations to our understanding of peer review. *Research integrity and peer review* 5(1), 6. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41073-020-00092-1>
- Kanton Sarajevo. (2022). Zakon o visokom obrazovanju Kantona Sarajevo. *Službene novine Kantona Sarajevo*, 36. <https://www.paragraf.ba/propisi/kantona-sarajevo/zakon-o-visokom-obrazovanju.html> [20. 7. 2025]
- BPK. (2021). Zakon o visokom obrazovanju Bosansko-podrinjskog kantona. *Službene novine Bosansko-podrinjskog kantona*, 4. <https://www.paragraf.ba/propisi/bosansko-podrinjski-kanton-gorazde/zakon-o-visokom-obrazovanju.html> [20. 7. 2025]
- RS. (2024). Zakon o visokom obrazovanju Republike Srpske. *Službeni glasnik RS*, 107. <https://www.paragraf.ba/propisi/republika-srpska/zakon-o-visokom-obrazovanju.html> [20. 7. 2025]
- ZHK. (2009). Zakon o visokom obrazovanju Zapadnohercegovačkog kantona. *Narodne novine Županije Zapadnohercegovačke*, 10. <https://www.paragraf.ba/propisi/zupanije-zapadnohercegovačke/zakon-o-visokom-obrazovanju.html> [10. 7. 2025]
- ZDK. (2022). Zakon o visokom obrazovanju Zeničko-dobojskog kantona. *Službene novine Zeničko-dobojskog kantona*. <https://www.paragraf.ba/propisi/zenicko-dobojskog-kantona/zakon-o-visokom-obrazovanju.html> [20. 7. 2025]

Vučković-Dekić, L. (2013). Recenzent – najveći prijatelj autora. *Biomedicinska istraživanja* 4(1), 75-9.

Weiler, J. H. (2012). Peer Review in crisis. *European journal of international law* 23(2), 309-313.

Dodatak – Popis časopisa iz područja humanističkih znanosti s dvostrukom anonimiziranom recenzijom iz BiH / **Appendix** – A list of B&H journals in the field of humanities with double blind peer review

- Bosanski jezik: časopis za kulturu bosanskoga književnog jezika*. Tuzla: Filozofski fakultet Univerziteta u Tuzli, Odsjek za bosanski jezik i književnost. (1997). <https://untz.ba/publikacije/casopis-bosanski-jezik/>
- Context: časopis za interdisciplinarne studije*. Sarajevo: Centar za napredne studije. (2014). <https://context.cns.ba/index.php/context>
- Filolog: časopis za jezik, književnost i kulturu*. Banja Luka: Filozofski fakultet Univerziteta u Banjoj Luci. (2010). <http://filolog.rs.ba/>
- Društvene i humanističke studije (DHS)*. Tuzla: Filozofski fakultet Univerziteta u Tuzli. (2016). <https://www.dhs.ff.untz.ba/index.php/home>
- Dijalog: časopis za filozofiju i društvenu teoriju*. Sarajevo: Akademija nauka i umjetnosti Bosne i Hercegovine. (1977). <https://dijalog.anubih.ba/index.php/dijalog>
- Anali Gazi Husrev-begove biblioteke*. Sarajevo: Gazi Husrev-begova biblioteka. (1972). <https://ghb.ba/anali-ghb-biblioteke/>
- Hercegovina: časopis za kulturno i povijesno naslijeđe*. Mostar: Sveučilište u Mostaru, Filozofski fakultet, Studij povijesti; Zagreb: Hrvatski institut za povijest. (1981). <https://hercegovina.ff.sum.ba/>
- Historijska misao*. Tuzla: Odsjek za historiju Filozofskog fakulteta Univerziteta u Tuzli. (2015). <https://hm.ff.untz.ba/index.php/hm>
- Historijski pogledi*. Tuzla: Centar za istraživanje moderne i savremene historije Tuzla. (2018) <https://pogledi.cimoshis.org/>
- Historijska traganja = Historical searches*. Sarajevo: Univerzitet u Sarajevu – Institut za historiju. (2020). <http://iis.unsa.ba/historijska-traganja/>
- Hum: časopis Filozofskog fakulteta Sveučilišta u Mostaru*. Mostar: Filozofski fakultet Sveučilišta u Mostaru. (2007). https://hum.ff.sum.ba/?page_id=6&lang=en
- Istraživanja: časopis Fakulteta humanističkih nauka*. Mostar: Fakultet humanističkih nauka Univerziteta “Džemal Bijedić” u Mostaru. (2006). <https://fhn.unmo.ba/naucno-istrazivacki-rad/casopis-istrazivanja/>
- Književni jezik*. Sarajevo: Univerzitet u Sarajevu – Institut za jezik. (1972). <https://izj.unsa.ba/knjizevni-jezik/>
- Logos: časopis za filozofiju i religiju*. Tuzla: Centar za kulturu i edukaciju – Logos. (2013). <http://www.logos.org.ba/arhiva>
- Mostariensia: časopis za humanističke znanosti*. Mostar: Sveučilište u Mostaru. (1994). <https://most.sum.ba/>
- Muzika: časopis za muzičku kulturu*. (2014). Sarajevo: Muzička akademija Univerziteta u Sarajevu; Muzikološko društvo FBiH. <http://muzika.mas.unsa.ba/en/pocetna/>
- Noema: časopis za humanističku i društvenu misao*. Banja Luka: Filozofski fakultet Univerziteta u Banjoj Luci. (2016). <https://noemabl.com/index.php/noema>
- Novi izraz: časopis za književnu i umjetničku kritiku*. Sarajevo: P.E.N. centar Bosne i Hercegovine. (2014). <http://www.penbih.ba/izraz/izraz.php>
- Pismo: časopis za jezik i književnost*. Sarajevo: Bosansko filološko društvo. (2003), <http://bfd.ba/o-casopisu/>
- Post Scriptum*. Bihać: Pedagoški fakultet Univerziteta u Bihaću. (2010). <http://ps.pfb.unbi.ba/>
- Pregled: časopis za društvena pitanja*. Sarajevo: Univerzitet u Sarajevu. (2019). <https://www.pregled.unsa.ba/index.php/pregled>
- Radovi Filozofskog fakulteta: časopis za humanističke i društvene nauke*. Istočno Sarajevo: Univerzitet u Istočnom Sarajevu. (1998). <https://radovi.ff.ues.rs.ba/>
- Radovi Filozofskog fakulteta u Sarajevu*. Sarajevo: Univerzitet u Sarajevu – Filozofski fakultet. (1963). <http://www.ff-eizdavastvo.ba/SerijskepublikacijeFFUNSA>
- Radovi (Historija, Historija umjetnosti, Arheologija) Filozofskog fakulteta u Sarajevu*. (2010). <https://ejournals.ff.unsa.ba/index.php/radovi/index>
- Saznanja. Časopis za historiju*. Tuzla: Društvo historičara Tuzla. (2005). <https://drustvohistoricaratuzla.ba/o-casopisu-za-historiju-saznanja/>
- Sineza: časopis za humanističke i društvene nauke*. Banja Luka: Filozofski fakultet Univerziteta u Banjoj Luci. (2020). <http://sineza.ff.unibl.org/sineza>
- Vrhbosnensia: časopis za teološka i međureligijska pitanja*. Sarajevo: Univerzitet u Sarajevu – Katolički bogoslovni fakulteti u Sarajevu. (2007). <https://kbf.unsa.ba/znanost/vrhbosnensia/>
- Znakovi vremena. Časopis za filozofiju, religiju, znanost i društvenu praksu*. Sarajevo: Naučnoistraživački institut “Ibn Sina” (1997). <https://www.ibn-sina.net/znakovi-vremena/>