**REVIEW GUIDELINES FOR SCIENTIFIC PAPERS**

1. **General guidelines:**

The principles of reviewing scientific papers published in “Consensus – Student Scientific Journals” are based on the recommendations outlined in the publication of the Ministry of Science and Higher Education [currently the Ministry of Education and Science]: *Dobre praktyki w procedurach recenzyjnych w nauce* [Good Practices in Peer Review Procedures in Science], Warsaw 2011.

1. **Specific guidelines:**
2. All academic papers submitted for publication are subject to evaluation and the review process.
3. By submitting a paper electronically for publication, authors automatically agree to undergo this review process.
4. Reviews are conducted by competent experts in the relevant field or scientific discipline who are not employed by the publisher and do not have any conflict of interest with the author.
5. Texts are reviewed confidentially and anonymously by two independent reviewers using a review form, which is an appendix to these guidelines.
6. A positive recommendation from the reviewers is required for a text to be accepted for publication.
7. If the reviewers suggest revisions, the publication of the text is conditional on the author considering these revisions.
8. The list of reviewers is published in each issue of the journal, both in the editorial section and on the publisher’s website.
9. Reviewers must not use any knowledge gained from reviewing a text before its publication.
10. The review process consists of the following stages:
11. Stage I – Formal evaluation by the editor or editorial secretary. If the text does not meet the basic linguistic standards or is not formatted according to the publisher’s editorial requirement, it is returned to the author.
12. Stage II – Preliminary substantive evaluation and review by subject editors. They conduct an initial academic assessment and propose the next steps: returning the text for revision or forwarding it for external review. Subject editors also suggest potential reviewers.
13. Stage III – Academic review by a second external reviewer.

**Appendix**

**REVIEW FORM**

Title of article……………………………………………………........

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1. | Does the paper’s title match its content? | YES/NO |
| 2. | Is the issue presented in the paper scientifically significant? |  |
| 3. | Does the paper contribute anything new to the existing literature on the subject? |  |
| 4. | Is the paper an original work (i.e., not a compilation of previously known publications)? |  |
| 5. | Is the aim of the paper clearly specified and realized? |  |
| 6. | Has the question been presented in a comprehensive way? |  |
| 7. | Does the article have a logical layout? |  |
| 8. | Is the subject bibliography sufficient? |  |
| 9. | Is the language of the paper correct? |  |
| 10. | Do conclusions result from the content? |  |

Suggested corrections (can be noted in text):

.......................................................................................................................................................

Conclusions and recommendation for publication: ……………………………………………………………………...............................................

Academic degree / name and surname of the reviewer .......................................................................................................................................................