



REVIEW PROCEDURE

The review procedure of the paper submitted for publication in the Scientific Journal of the Polish Economic Society in Zielona Góra is based on the recommendations of the Ministry of Science and Higher Education included in the publication: *Dobre praktyki w procedurach recenzyjnych w nauce (Good practice in review procedures in science)*.

1. Two external reviewers, experts in particular areas of sciences, are appointed to evaluate submitted papers (provided they meet editorial requirements).
2. In case of texts written in other languages than Polish, at least one of the reviewers is affiliated at an international institution, in a country different than the nationality of the author of the paper.
3. Competence, confirmed by significant scientific achievements, constitutes the basic criterion of the choice of both Polish and foreign reviewers.
4. Reviewers are chosen by the chief editor of the periodical on the basis of the criterion of compliance with the profile of the journal and in agreement with the contents editor.
5. While appointing reviewers, the Editorial Board observed the principle of avoiding the conflict of interest between the reviewer and the author. Conflict of interest is understood as follows: direct personal relations (kinship, legal connections, or conflict), professional subordination, or direct scientific cooperation during two years preceding the review.
6. A selected reviewer receives from the chief editor of the contents editor an offer of reviewing, along with brief information about the paper and proposal of the contract. Upon approval of the offer, the reviewer signs the contract and receives a full text of the paper (papers), along with the review form and other potential materials. The review is performed on the basis of the review form, which contains suggestion concerning the criteria of the evaluation of the paper (scientific significance of the presented issue, original methods or approach to the topic, cohesion and logical argumentation, clear formulation and accomplishment of the goal of the paper, correct argumentation and conclusion, appropriate bibliography and graphic illustration). Apart from these criteria, the reviewer expresses his/her opinion in the form of a text. While making the final evaluation of the paper, the reviewer has three options: (1) explicit recommendation for publishing the paper, (2) conditional recommendation (the paper requires corrections), (3) rejection of the paper. The publication of the paper depends on the results of both reviews, and in case of doubts, the paper may be sent to the third reviewer and / or the final decision is made by the Editorial Board on the basis of the results of two reviews.
7. Reviews, compiled in writing, are delivered in two copies to the chief editor. One copy of the review is archived by the Polish Economic Society in Zielona Góra, the second and anonymous, is sent to the author.
8. Reviews containing critical remarks and suggestions are delivered to the author by the chief editor. If there is a difference of opinions concerning the legitimacy of suggested changes, it has to be explained which corrections were taken into consideration, and in case they are taken into consideration, the rationale of the decision must be presented. Following the correction, papers are sent to the reviewers for approval, unless the contents of the reviews or contract with the reviewer state otherwise.
9. The final decision concerning the publication of papers is made by the chief editor in cooperation with the contents editor. Papers awarded with the minimum of 50 points will be published in the Scientific Journal of the Polish Economic Society in Zielona Góra.
10. In case of one negative review, the chief editor (or the contents editor) decides about the rejection of the paper or directs it to another reviewer. In case of two negative reviews, the paper is not accepted.
11. At the stage of collecting reviews, the review procedure is confidential. Reviewers and authors of publications are not aware of their identity. The principle of 'double-blind review process' is applied. Reviews are available only to authorized persons implementing and monitoring the editorial procedure. The secretary of the Editorial Board, who delivers the remarks concerning the texts to their authors in the form of review forms, is responsible for the correspondence with the reviewers.
12. The editorial review is compiled on the basis of the contract for review. Reviews which do not conform to the contract and the hereby procedure are not accepted. Reviews which do not meet the contents or formal requirements of editorial review of a scientific paper, e.g. a trite review, a review containing unjustified critical opinions or unmotivated commendation, deprived of logical connection between of the contents and conclusions, definitely critical, yet containing a positive conclusion, or vice versa, will not be accepted. Rejection of reviews applies also to reviews delivered after the deadline specified in the contract. Reviewers are entitled to remuneration. The remuneration is regulated by the resolution of Management Board of the Polish Economic Society in Zielona Góra on author's fees for scientific publication in the Polish Economic Society in Zielona Góra. The reviewer delivers the review along with a filled in and signed bill. The contents of the scientific paper are not made available to the reviewer prior to the conclusion of the contract for paper review.

OBLIGATIONS OF THE REVIEWERS

1. An expert who receives the proposal to review a scientific paper is obliged to specify his/her competence in respect of contents as well as practical possibilities of compiling the review in due time, in case of doubts the proposal should be rejected.
2. Reviews should be compiled and delivered to the Polish Economic Society in Zielona Góra before the deadline specified in the contract, in case the deadline cannot be met, the reviewer is obliged to contact the Editorial Board and agree a new, possibly not distant date of compiling the review.
3. In case of conflict of interest, or occurrence of circumstances in which the parties may be suspected of such conflict, papers should not be accepted for review. Reviewers must not be related to the author of the reviewed paper or the subject ordering the review in any way which could influence the accuracy or objectivity of the review or its public credibility. In view of the conflict of interest or the risk of its occurrence, papers, whose authors are friends, associates or subordinates, family members, persons who may in probable and predictable circumstances become superiors of the reviewer or may obtain the authority to decide in cases important to him/her, should not be accepted.
4. Reviewers should not resign from compiling the review following the conclusion of the contract, except for specific and unpredictable circumstances. If after conclusion of the contract and reading the paper, the reviewer finds out that he/she is not competent enough to compile a review, the reviewer is entitled to terminate the contract on the basis of delivering a written explanation guaranteeing that the reason of the withdrawal is not caused by an attempt to avoid writing a negative review.
5. Reviewers are obliged to familiarize themselves carefully with the reviewed paper and fairly evaluate its scientific value, independence and innovativeness – depending on the current state of knowledge in a given area as well as relevant requirements (resulting from legal regulations, concluded contract and academic practice) expected from the reviewers of scientific publications.
6. Reviews should be matter of fact in character, logical and cohesive. They must not be trite. They must be compiled on forms prepared by the Editorial Board. They should end with clear and unambiguous conclusions – positive or negative. Review conclusions should be justified in their analytical sections. The review procedure admits correction of papers on a proposal of the reviewer, if the reviewer presents a conditionally positive opinion and expects that appropriate corrections should be introduced. In such case the reviewer is entitled to, and if the contract states otherwise, is obliged to review the paper again.

The list of reviewers is published on the website of the Journal of the Polish Economic Society in Zielona Góra (www.journal.ptezg.pl) and in the periodical.