

Review procedure of ‘Court Review’

1. All materials submitted to ‘Court Review’ [*Przegląd Sądowy*] are first editorially assessed by the members of the editorial board. The editorial board may ask people from outside the board for their assessment.
2. The editorial board may refuse to publish the article including, in particular (but not exclusively) because of a lack of compliance with the journal’s thematic profile or a rejection on substantive grounds. In such a case, the article is not forwarded for external review and the editorial board informs the author that the article has been rejected. In the event of a preliminary acceptance, the academic article undergoes the procedure of external review.
3. Two independent reviewers from outside the academic unit with which the author of the article is affiliated are appointed to review every publication that is not a report or review of another publication. All aspects of the academic work are assessed.
4. **The review is prepared in writing and may assume the form of:**
 - a) a positive review;
 - b) a positive review on condition that specified changes are made;
 - c) a review for correction;
 - d) a negative review.
5. The waiting period for the assessment is approximately 4 weeks.
6. The editorial board, guided by the results of the reviews received and the publication plans, makes the decision on whether or not to publish the article.
7. The originals of the reviews are kept at the ‘Court Review’ editorial office.
8. The editorial office may provide a justification of the refusal or an anonymized copy of the external review at the author’s request. If the conclusions from the review are duplicated, the editorial office will provide an anonymized copy of the review selected by the editorial board.
9. The review takes place as a double-blind review process in which neither the reviewers nor the authors know who the others are.
10. The list of reviewers working with the journal is published in print form and posted in the ‘Court Review’ website once a year, without identifying the reviewer of a specific publication.
11. These principles have been drafted in accordance with the guidelines published by the Minister of Science and Higher Education.

See also: Responsibilities of reviewers in: Ethical principles regarding publications in academic journals, <https://www.wolterskluwer.com/pl-pl/solutions/czasopisma/zasady-etyczne>