

The review procedure adopted in the European Review of Law and International

Relations:

1. the procedure for reviewing texts submitted to the editors of the EPPiSM (scientific articles and glosses) is in each case a two-stage process. It begins in the editorial office of EPPiSM with internal editorial reviews (stage one), prepared and communicated in writing or communicated orally to the editorial secretary by the editor-in-chief; the latter may use the opinions (written and oral) provided by members of the EPPiSM Program Council, according to their scientific specialization.

2. The final decision to qualify a text for the second stage, i.e. external reviews, is made by the editor-in-chief. If the editorial board rejects the submitted text after completion of internal reviews, it is not subject to further review procedure.

3. For each text qualified for stage two, the editorial board - if necessary with the support of members of the EPPiSM Program Council - shall appoint at least two reviewers who are experienced academics specializing in the in the subject matter that is the subject of the article or glossary. The reviewers are from outside the author's affiliated unit. They shall be independent academics with a postdoctoral degree; in justified cases (and with the exception indicated in point 6), the EPPiSM editorial board shall also entrust the preparation of reviews to persons with a doctoral degrees to prepare reviews, if they have the necessary experience and expertise.

4. In EPPiSM, the principle of double (full) anonymization [double-blind review] applies, i.e., both reviewers do not know the personalities of the author(s) until the article or glossary is made public, and the authors do not know the personalities of either of the two reviewers.

If, exceptionally, for legitimate reasons, there is a need to disclose the author's personalities to the reviewer, the reviewer is obliged to make a declaration of no conflict of interest; such is considered to be between the reviewer and the author:

- direct personal relations,
- relations of professional subordination,
- scientific cooperation in the last two years preceding the preparation of the review.

5. The review shall be in writing. It is prepared on a special EPPiSM review form (containing, among other things, the publisher's logo), which the editors make available to reviewers. The form consists of a descriptive and an application part. Completion by the reviewer of the conclusion part is mandatory.

The conclusions of the review can only be of three types:

a) unconditional (without author's corrections) admission of the text for publication [positive review];

b) rejection of the text, i.e., not allowing it to be published [negative review];

c) conditional admission of the text for publication - after meeting the indicated additional requirements, usually consisting of the introduction (to varying degrees) of author's corrections and/or additions [positive conditional review].

6. In contentious situations - if one of the two reviews is negative - an additional, third reviewer is appointed, whose opinion determines whether the text is accepted for publication or rejected. This additional reviewer always holds an academic degree of doctoral degree.

7. The reviewer evaluates the article or glossary primarily in terms of content: scientific quality, originality, clarity of communication, adopted research methodology, selection and use of sources, as well as compliance with publication ethics. However, the opinion may also concern the formal side: linguistic correctness (including the use of a foreign language, if the text is written in it), the correctness of drawing up abstracts, footnotes, etc.

In order to verify the linguistic level of publications prepared in a foreign language, the editors may appoint additional persons with the necessary expertise and linguistic knowledge.

8. All comments contained in both reviews shall be forwarded to the author. If the review is conditional, the author undertakes to meet (within the period agreed upon with the editors) the conditions indicated by the reviewer and to respect all his comments and suggestions. If the reviewer has stipulated that the text can be published only after the reviewer has accepted the author's corrections and additions, the modified version will be sent by the editors to the reviewer for approval.

(9) If the author disagrees with the reviewer's comments, he has the right to polemicize. The author sends it to the editor with a clear indication of which elements of the review it concerns,

as well as a justification of his position. The final decision to include or reject - in whole or in part - the author's polemic with the reviewer's comments, after necessary consultation with members of the EPPiSM Program Council, is made by the editor-in-chief.

(10) The time for drafting a review in EPPiSM should not exceed one month; it may be extended only in justified cases.

(11) The full list of reviewers cooperating with EPPiSM is posted on the journal's website, usually at the end of a given calendar year, without mentioning the titles of the reviewed texts.

(12) Submission of a text for publication is tantamount to the author's agreement to undergo the review procedure adopted at EPPiSM.