

## Procedure for the review/assessment of scientific papers

### § 1. General remarks

1. With the aim of ensuring the highest quality of its publications, the publishing house Wydawnictwo C.H.Beck (the “Publisher”) has adopted the following mandatory procedure for reviewing/evaluating scientific papers.
2. Scientific papers to be published by the Publisher will be subject to an internal pre-publication review and the process of an external/scientific review.
3. A publication will be proposed in accordance with § 3. of the PROCEDURAL STANDARDS OF QUALIFYING SCIENTIFIC PAPERS FOR PUBLICATION IN WYDAWNICTWO C.H.BECK, available on the Publisher’s website at [www.beck.pl/zasady-publikacji](http://www.beck.pl/zasady-publikacji).
4. In the event that the paper proposed for publication is a thesis presented as a requirement for an academic degree, it is necessary to attach:
  - a. in the case of a doctoral thesis – an opinion from the scientific supervisor (doctoral advisor) and positive scientific reviews,
  - b. in the case of a habilitation thesis – an independent pre-publication/scientific review;
  - c. in the case of a professorial thesis – two independent pre-publication/scientific reviews.
  - d. If the paper proposed for publication is not a doctoral or habilitation thesis, it is necessary to attach an opinion of the scientific supervisor, or an independent pre-publication/scientific review.

### § 2. Procedure of the internal pre-publication review/evaluation

1. A scientific paper is subject to the internal review/evaluation procedure after it has been proposed for publication.
2. A paper may be entered onto the publishing schedule of the Publisher only after all the steps of the internal review/evaluation procedure have been fulfilled.
3. The internal review/evaluation procedure consists of the following steps:
  - a. **Step 1.** Preliminary review/evaluation of the paper by the Editorial Secretariat or the Editor. The proposed paper is subject to a preliminary evaluation with respect to keeping all the formal requirements set out in § 3 of Standards. After it has been positively evaluated, the proposal is presented to the Editor-in-chief. Fulfilment of formal requirements means that the paper is approved for the next step of the internal review/evaluation procedure.
  - b. **Step 2.** Review/evaluation of the paper by the Editor-in-chief. A publication will not be approved for further processing under the internal review/evaluation



procedure if its contents are inconsistent with the title, if there are factual errors, if the text is ostensibly not original, if the bibliography is superficial and insufficient for a paper in a given field, or if the subject discussed in the paper is of no interest to the Publisher. If the paper is not accepted, the author will be informed that the paper has not been approved to be entered onto the publishing schedule of the Publisher. If the above requirements are met, it means that the paper is approved for the next step of the pre-publishing review/evaluation procedure. As part of the preparations of the scientific paper for further processing, the Publisher will produce a publication card and cost estimate.

- c. **Step 3.** Review/evaluation of the paper by the Editorial Board. Having been positively assessed by the Editor-in-chief, the publication will be subject to an evaluation by the Editorial Board, comprising the Heads of all Editorial Teams, and the Marketing and Sales Departments. A positive evaluation by the Editorial Board in accordance with the internal evaluation criteria set out in § 5 of Standards allows the paper to be entered onto the publishing plan of the Publisher.
4. During its internal review/evaluation of the paper, the Editorial Board will consider the following criteria:
  - a. subject selection: the issue discussed in the text is of a scientific nature; the contents are consistent with the subject;
  - b. structure and methodology of the paper: the text has been correctly structured; it has been based on appropriate and up-to-date research as regards the doctrine and case-law, and contains properly prepared footnotes; the subject has been analysed in a consistent and comprehensible manner;
  - c. scientific significance of the paper: the text is sufficiently original, when compared with the existing state of research; the subject or methodology are innovative or make a major contribution to the existing state of knowledge;
  - d. factual correctness of the paper: the text is accurate with respect to facts; it is based on current legislation and correctly quotes the regulations and opinions of the case law and doctrine; the selected methodology has been properly applied; the text is correct rhetorically and with respect to the logic of the argument;
  - e. significance of the subject chosen by the author for the development of a given field of science in Poland;
  - f. significance of the subject chosen by the author for the application of law in Poland (legal practice);
  - g. level of scientific expertise, as compared with other scientific papers published so far by the Publisher.
5. A positive review/assessment of the paper by the Editorial Board is tantamount to a decision to enter the paper onto the publishing schedule of the Publisher, and the



decision to sign a copyrights contract with the author on terms specified by the Editorial Board.

6. The review/evaluation of the paper by the Editorial Board will be recorded in its publication card. The publication card is an internal document of the Publisher.
7. Decisions of the Editorial Board on the acceptance or non-acceptance of papers to the publishing schedule will be communicated to the authors by the Editorial Secretariat of the Publisher by email.
8. As a result of a positive review/assessment of the paper by the Editorial Board, a copyright contract will be signed with the author on terms specified by the Editorial Board.
9. In performance of the copyright contract, the author will provide the scientific paper to the Publisher. The provided paper will be accepted after its compliance with the terms specified by the Editorial Board laid down in the publication card has been checked.

### **§ 3. Procedure of the external/scientific review**

1. Before starting the external/scientific review process – if there are doubts as to the factual value of the paper – the Publisher will analyse the documents attached to the paper pursuant to § 1.4 of this Procedure.
2. Before accepting the paper to be entered to the publishing schedule, the Publisher may oblige the author to submit it to external/scientific review.
3. A scientific paper may be reviewed by one or more independent reviewers appointed from among the scientific staff of organisations other than those in which its author is employed. One or more reviewers will be selected by the Publisher. The author may contest the selection. The final decision in this respect will be made by the Publisher.
4. An open external/scientific review (both the reviewers and the author know each other's names) will end with an express conclusion as to:
  - a. the acceptance of the paper without corrections,
  - b. the acceptance of the paper after the required corrections have been made,
  - c. the rejection of the paper.
5. The reviewers will evaluate the paper based on the following criteria:
  - a. subject selection: the issue discussed in the text is of a scientific nature; the contents are consistent with the subject;
  - b. structure and methodology of the paper: the text has been correctly structured; it has been based on adequate and up-to-date research as regards the doctrine and case-law, and contains properly prepared footnotes; the subject has been analysed in a consistent and comprehensible manner;



- c. scientific significance of the paper: the text has an original character as compared with the existing state of research; the subject or methodology are innovative or make a major contribution to the existing state of knowledge;
  - d. factual correctness of the paper: the text is accurate with respect to facts; it is based on current legislation and correctly quotes the regulations and opinions of the case law and doctrine; the selected methodology has been properly applied; the text is correct rhetorically and with respect to the logic of the argument.
6. The author will receive the results of the review. Should the review conclude with a recommendation to accept the paper to the publishing schedule after required corrections have been made, the author will be obliged to make those corrections.
  7. If it is necessary to make corrections to the paper, the reviewer will formulate an evaluation with an opinion on which elements of the paper need to be corrected.
  8. If the review or one of the reviews is negative, the text will be rejected. The Publisher will decide not to accept the paper to its publishing schedule.
  9. In particularly justified cases, the Publisher may send the scientific paper for a double-blind review process – where the reviewers and the author do not know each other's names). The procedure for this review is the same as in the case of the review process opened in accordance with sections 4-8 above. The decision to send the paper for a double-blind review process will be made by the Publisher.

#### **§ 4. Final remarks**

1. The Editorial Secretariat will send the results of the review, along with any recommendations of the reviewer to introduce necessary corrections, to the author's email address.
2. Decisions of the Editorial Board as to the acceptance or non-acceptance of papers to the publishing schedule will be communicated to the authors by the Editorial Secretariat of the Publisher by email.