REVIEW PROCESS

1. The procedure of reviewing articles is in accordance with the principles of reviewing included in the Announcement of the Minister of Science and Higher Education of 29 May 2013.
2. By submitting a paper for publication in the journal, the authors consent to the reviewing process.
3. Submitted publications are first evaluated by the ADHIBENDA Editorial Board.
4. The publications are then reviewed by two reliable reviewers with at least a PhD degree.
5. The submitted papers will not be sent to reviewers from the same institution as the Authors and to persons who may have a conflict of interest with the Author. A conflict of interest is understood to be a professional relationship (professional subordination), direct scientific collaboration (within the last two years preceding the year of preparing the review) and direct personal relationships (kinship to the second degree, marriage) between the reviewer and the author of the reviewed text. The members of the Editorial Board (Editor-in-Chief, Deputy Editor-in-Chief and Editorial Secretary) are also not reviewers.
6. Papers are reviewed confidentially and anonymously (double blind review process).
7. The manuscript is given an editorial number, which identifies it at further stages of the publishing process.
8. Reviewers are obliged to maintain confidentiality and secrecy of all information provided by the Editor. Reviewers must not use their knowledge of a paper before its publication.
9. Reviewers should alert the Editor if the reviewed article is similar to any previously published content
10. The reviewer shall submit the review in electronic form to the e-mail address of the Editor given on the review form and in paper form with a handwritten signature, which shall be kept by the Editor for 5 years.
11. The review must contain an unambiguous conclusion of the reviewer concerning the conditions of accepting the article for publication or rejecting it. Reviews that do not meet the substantive and formal requirements of a scientific review, including those dominated by unmotivated critical opinions or unmotivated praise, lacking a logical connection between the content and conclusion, i.e. reviews that are strongly critical but with a positive conclusion, or vice versa, will not be considered.
12. The final qualification for publication is made by the Editor-in-Chief on the basis of the analysis of comments contained in the review and the final version of the article provided by the author.
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