



**STUDIA IURIDICA Cassoviensia**

Faculty of Law, Pavol Jozef Šafárik University in Košice  
Kováčska 26, P.O.BOX A-45, 040 75 Košice, Slovakia  
IČO: 00397768, IČ DPH: SK2021157050  
tel./ VoIP: +421 55 / 234 4172, fax: +421 55 / 622 53 65  
e-mail: redakcia\_SIC@upjs.sk, <http://www.pravo.upjs.sk>

**RULES OF PEER REVIEW PROCESS**

**of scientific Journal**

**STUDIA IURIDICA Cassoviensia**

**PEER REVIEW PROCESS**

**§ 1**

1. The Editorial Office sends the following texts for review: scientific articles.
2. Before sending for review, all texts submitted for publication are verified using anti-plagiarism software, the report from the verification being made available to reviewers without revealing the identity of the Author.

**§ 2**

1. To assess each publication, at least two independent reviewers shall be appointed from outside the organizational unit (Department/institute) affiliated by the author.

**§ 3**

The author and reviewers shall not know the identities of one another (*double-blind review process*).

**§ 4**

Reviewers shall be appointed by the Editor-in-Chief in cooperation with the Editorial Committee. Where necessary, the relevant members of the Editorial Board shall be consulted.

**§ 5**

1. The reviewer, when accepting the request to review a manuscript submitted to *STUDIA IURIDICA Cassoviensia*, shall make a declaration of the lack of conflict of interest.
2. A conflict of interest shall be deemed to be the relationship arising from a competitive activity, cooperation or other personal, financial or professional relationships of the reviewer with any of the authors or institutions related to the manuscript submitted.

## **§ 6**

1. The review shall be made in writing and shall be concluded with a proposal to either publish the text or reject it, or publish after implementation of remarks..
2. The reviewer shall prepare the review in electronic form via electronic form provided by Editorial Office. The journal's electronic form does not allow the identification of both the author of the manuscript and the reviewer.
3. The reviewer is given individual access to the author's text file and the report on the verification of the submitted manuscript with anti-plagiarism software. The file with the author's text and anti-plagiarism software report provided to the reviewer does not allow identification of the author.
4. The reviewer may choose the following recommendations concerning the peer-reviewed manuscript: Accept Submission; Revisions Required; Decline Submission.
5. In situations of controversy or in the event of inconsistent reviews, the admission to publication shall be decided by an editorial board, which may appoint an additional reviewer or reviewers.
6. Only manuscripts which have got two positive reviews shall be allowed for publication.

## **§ 7**

1. Once the review is received, their content shall be communicated to the author without disclosing the identity of the reviewers.
2. The author of the text is obliged to respond substantively to all comments and conclusions posted in the review.
3. In the case of conditional reviews, the editorial board may allow the manuscript for publication provided that the author modifies the text as indicated by the reviewer and confirms this fact in the relevant statement, which should be submitted to the editor.

## **§ 8**

1. The names of reviewers of individual articles shall not be disclosed.

### **Guidelines for Reviewers DECISION TO PREPARE A REVIEW**

#### **§ 1**

##### **1. [Expressing consent to the preparation of the review]**

2.

Before agreeing to prepare the review, the reviewer should consider whether the topic and subject matter of the text are consistent with his/her competence or research interests. The reviewer should refuse to prepare a review if he/she finds himself/herself as not having sufficient knowledge to draw up a reliable and substantive opinion.

##### **2. [Timeliness]**

The reviewer should refuse to prepare a review if he/she cannot spare enough time to meet the deadline for its preparation. The intended time to write a review of one manuscript is 4 weeks. If the complexity of the subject matter or the number of texts sent for review requires a longer time to prepare the review, one should notify the editor and possibly agree upon the postponement of the deadline. If the reviewer finds it impossible to timely draw up the review is not possible, he/she should notify the editor without undue delay so as other potential reviewers can be contacted.

##### **3. [Conflict of interest]**

The reviewer should not undertake to review texts about which there is a reasonable suspicion of a conflict of interest resulting from competition, cooperation or other personal, financial or professional relationships with any of the authors or institutions related to the submitted manuscript.

## **ASSESSMENT CRITERIA FOR MANUSCRIPTS TO BE REVIEWED**

### **§ 2 [Assessment criteria]**

The reviewer should assess the manuscript taking into account: 1) the compliance of the reviewed text with the journal's profile; 2) the substantive side of the text and compliance of the article with the IMRAD structure (*Introduction, Materials & Methods, Results and Discussion*); 3) the correctness of the selection and application of research methods and their innovativeness; 4) the number and correctness of the selection of sources and literature, in particular bibliographic items on the lists of SCOPUS and Web of Science; 5) compliance of the abstract, keywords and references with the requirements of the journal; 6) the level of research tools; 7) the consistency and clarity of the text; 8) the language level.

### **§ 3 [Compliance of the reviewed text with the journal's profile]**

1. The reviewer shall assess the manuscript in terms of compliance of the reviewed text with the journal's profile.
2. The reviewer finds whether the thematic scope of the reviewed text falls within the scientific discipline of law.

### **§ 4 [The substantive side of the text]**

1. The reviewer shall state whether the reviewed manuscript is an original scientific work that provides high cognitive value for legal science (law) or legal practice.
2. The reviewer shall assess whether the reviewed manuscript is sufficiently innovative and of interest for the national or international academic community.
3. The reviewer should specify, in particular, whether the text contains research results of international or national significance, and whether the obtained research results stand out from other results of research conducted within a given scientific discipline.
4. The reviewer shall state whether the scientific article consists of separate parts, in accordance with the IMRAD structure: (*Introduction, Materials & Methods, Results and Discussion*).
5. The review should especially state:
  - 1) whether the title is consistent with the research problems presented in the article;
  - 2) whether the introduction defines: the aim and subject matter of the article; the essence of the problem; research hypotheses; the current state of research; innovativeness of the discussion;
  - 3) whether the author described and correctly selected and applied research methods; whether the charts or tables contained in the article are legible and correctly presented;
  - 4) whether the research process was correctly carried out by the author and whether the obtained results constitute elements of new knowledge;
  - 5) whether in the summary and conclusions, the author presents theses and formulates answers to the questions posed in the introduction, points to elements of new knowledge, refers to the results of other scientists' research, determines the significance of the research in the field of legal sciences (law).

### **§ 5 [Literature and sources]**

The reviewer shall assess whether the author of the manuscript has appropriately taken into account in his research the relevant sources and literature on the subject and whether he has used bibliographic items listed on SCOPUS and Web of Science.

#### **§ 6 [Abstract and keywords]**

1. The reviewer shall state whether the abstract of the manuscript being reviewed complies with the requirements set out in the guidelines for authors, in particular whether the abstract of the scientific article specifies: the nature of the article; the subject of research; the main theses; the aim of research; the originality of research results; the scope of research, the cognitive value for science or practice.
2. The reviewer shall assess the correctness of the keywords selected by the author.

#### **§ 7 [Language and technical standards of the text]**

1. The reviewer shall assess the linguistic level, stylistic values, consistency and clarity of the text.
2. The reviewer shall state whether the manuscript is in line with the rules for text formatting, footnotes and references set out in the guidelines for authors.

### **ETHICS RULES**

#### **§ 8 [Suspected redundant (duplicate) publication]**

1. If the reviewer suspects that the reviewed text is a redundant (duplicate) publication, he/she shall notify the editor.
2. A redundant (duplicate) publication is to be understood as a manuscript in which the author reproduces his/her own previously published papers in the form of a literal or partial repetition of his/her own publications or the submission of a text published in another language.
3. The reviewer should make available to the editor the relevant evidence which forms the basis for the suspicion that the publication is redundant (duplicate).
4. Where the reviewer reports a suspected redundant (duplicate) publication, the editor shall carry out a proceeding compliant with the relevant rules set out by COPE (*The Committee on Publication Ethics*) referred to at <https://publicationethics.org/guidance/Flowcharts>.

#### **§ 9 [Suspected plagiarism in a submitted manuscript]**

1. The reviewer should inform the editor of the suspected plagiarism.
2. Plagiarism is defined as either the acquisition of someone else's work in whole or in large part in its unchanged form or with minor modifications (explicit plagiarism), or the presentation of someone else's work in a modified form, while retaining the creative and individual characteristics given to it by the actual author (hidden plagiarism).
3. The reviewer should make available to the editor the relevant evidence which forms the basis for the suspicion of plagiarism.
4. Where the reviewer reports a suspected plagiarism, the editor shall carry out a proceeding compliant with the relevant rules set out by COPE (*The Committee on Publication Ethics*) referred to at <https://publicationethics.org/guidance/Flowcharts>.

#### **§ 10 [Suspected fabricated data in a submitted manuscript]**

1. If the reviewer suspects that the data used in the submitted manuscript have been fabricated, should notify the editor of this.
2. Data fabrication occurs where the author of the manuscript presents the results of research work which has not taken place or changes the results of the research carried out in an arbitrary or unjustified manner.

3. The reviewer should present to the editor appropriate evidence, which is the basis for suspicion that the data used in the submitted manuscript has been fabricated.
4. Where the reviewer reports suspected fabrication of data, the editor shall carry out a proceeding compliant with the relevant rules set out by COPE (*The Committee on Publication Ethics*) referred to at <https://publicationethics.org/guidance/Flowcharts>.

### **§ 11 [Suspected ghost, guest or gift authorship]**

1. If the reviewer suspects that a manuscript was written by someone who was not on the list of authors or who was not properly included in the acknowledgements or lists authors that should not be credited (guest or gift authors), he/she should inform the editor.
2. The evaluation of ghost, guest or gift authorship shall be performed pursuant to relevant rules defined by COPE (*The Committee on Publication Ethics*) (<https://publicationethics.org/guidance/Flowcharts>):
  - 1) A ghost author is someone who is omitted from an authorship list despite qualifying for authorship.
  - 2) A guest or gift author is someone who is listed as an author despite not qualifying for authorship. Guests are people brought in to make the list look more impressive (despite having little or no involvement with the research or publication). Gift authorship involves including colleagues on papers in return for being listed on theirs.
3. The reviewer should make available to the editor any relevant evidence that is a basis for the suspicion of ghost, guest or gift authorship.
4. Where the reviewer reports the suspected ghost, guest or gift authorship, the editor shall carry out a proceeding compliant with the relevant rules set out by COPE (*The Committee on Publication Ethics*) referred to at <https://publicationethics.org/guidance/Flowcharts>.

### **§ 12 [Undisclosed conflict of interest in a submitted manuscript]**

1. If the reviewer suspects an undisclosed conflict of interest in the submitted manuscript, he/she shall notify the editor.
2. A conflict of interest may arise from a competitive activity, cooperation or other personal, financial or professional relationships with any of the authors or institutions related to the manuscript submitted.
3. Where the reviewer reports the suspicion of an undisclosed conflict of interest in the submitted manuscript, the editor shall carry out a proceeding compliant with the relevant rules set out by COPE (*The Committee on Publication Ethics*) referred to at <https://publicationethics.org/guidance/Flowcharts>.

### **§ 13 [Ethical problem with a submitted manuscript]**

1. If the reviewer suspects a specific ethical problem with a submitted manuscript, he/she shall notify the editor.
2. Where the reviewer reports that there is an ethical problem with a submitted manuscript, the editor shall carry out a proceeding compliant with the relevant rules set out by COPE (*The Committee on Publication Ethics*) referred to at <https://publicationethics.org/guidance/Flowcharts>.

### **§ 14 [Confidentiality]**

1. Texts received for review must be treated as confidential documents. They may not be disclosed or discussed with other persons, unless the reviewer has obtained the editor's consent.
2. Non-published materials disclosed in the submitted manuscript may not be used in the reviewer's own research without the express written consent of the author.
3. Where there is a suspicion that the reviewer misappropriated the author's ideas or data, the editor shall carry out a proceeding compliant with the relevant rules set out by COPE (*The Committee on Publication Ethics*) referred to at <https://publicationethics.org/guidance/Flowcharts>.

### **§ 15 [Objectivity of a review]**

1. Reviews should be conducted objectively.
2. Personal criticism of the author is unacceptable.