

## Appendix no. 6. Procedure for Reviewing Monographs Submitted for Publication to the FRSE Publishing House

These procedures for reviewing apply to scientific publications. In the case of the FRSE Publishing House Monographs contest, the prerequisite for starting this process is passing the stage of preliminary and substantive evaluation described in § 5 of the Terms and Conditions.

1. Reviewers may be independent scholars with at least a Ph.D. degree from outside the academic unit affiliated by the Author(s)/Scientific Editor of the work. Reviewers cannot be FRSE employees or retired FRSE employees.
2. Reviewers may be appointed by the Scientific Board of the FRSE Publishing House or the Research & Publishing Unit, following the principle of preventing any conflict of interest between the Author(s) of the work and the Reviewers, and the principle of matching the Reviewer's specialisation to the subject of the reviewed work in the best possible way. In the case of research reports or theoretical analyses, the composition of the review panel will enable to obtain an opinion on the selection and application of the methodology.
3. Works are reviewed according to the principle of double-blind peer review. The process of reviewing a work is carried out exclusively through the Research & Publishing Unit: correspondence is carried out by its staff, and all identifiable data of the Author(s)/Scientific Editor or Reviewers are removed from the publication under review and from the review.
4. The review should consist of a description of the publication and detailed comments and recommendations from the Reviewer considering the following aspects of the work:
  - a. What new and important contributions the text makes to the source literature;
  - b. What are the strengths and weaknesses of the text;
  - c. Whether the purpose of the work and its main thesis have been formulated correctly;
  - d. Whether it draws on the latest research findings and the selected source literature is relevant to the issues covered;
  - e. Whether the subject matter of the study is innovative (i.e. not a compilation of already known publications) and the manner of its presentation complies with the rules for citing published work;
  - f. Whether the research methods have been selected, applied and described appropriately;
  - g. To what extent the interpretation is relevant to the results;
  - h. Whether the conclusions have been well documented and the results contribute new elements to scientific knowledge;
  - i. Whether the considerations included in the study are clear and logical and the structure of the study is clear, coherent and consistent;

- j. Whether the study is written in a correct, professional and understandable language and the illustrations included in the work (tables, figures, diagrams, etc.) have been correctly elaborated and presented;
  - k. To what extent the issues covered in the study can be used in research practice or for the development of scientific theory;
  - l. To what extent the issues covered in the study are useful for the development of the education system or for social development;
  - m. Whether the Reviewer has identified any ethical violations, conflicts of interest, or other deficiencies that may disqualify the study.
5. The review summary should include one of the following conclusions:
- i. the work is suitable for publication after editorial changes;
  - ii. the work is suitable for publication after incorporating the Reviewer's comments;
  - iii. the work requires substantial changes and the Reviewer's approval;
  - iv. the work is not suitable for publication.
6. Successful completion of the review stage is required for the work to be accepted and for the publishing process to begin.
7. In the case of a conditional review, the Director of the Research & Publishing Unit or a designated person returns the work to the Author(s)/Scientific editor to be corrected according to the indicated recommendations. The Author has three weeks to respond to the Reviewer's comments, make necessary changes to the work and prepare a written response to the reviews. The work is then submitted to the Reviewers for a revision, which verifies the Author's adherence to the guidelines.
8. In contentious situations, the Research & Publishing Unit, with the support of the Scientific Board, proposes a method of resolution, guided by the principles of the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE).
9. In the case of two negative reviews or a negative response by the Author(s)/Scientific editor to the comments of the Reviewers, the Director of the Unit has the right to decline to publish the work.

### Review form template

Having reviewed the contents of the work under the title:

.....  
.....

I propose

*(please select one option)*

- a. to accept the work for publication after editorial changes.
- b. to accept the work for publication after incorporating the reviewer's comments.
- c. to accept the work for publication on the condition that substantial changes are made and the reviewer's approval is obtained.
- d. not to accept the work for publication.

### Reasons for the decision

Please consider the following aspects of the work in your evaluation:

1. What new and important contributions the text makes to the source literature;
2. What are the strengths and weaknesses of the text;
3. Whether the purpose of the work and its main thesis have been formulated correctly;
4. Whether it draws on the latest research findings and the selected source literature is relevant to the issues covered;
5. Whether the subject matter of the study is innovative (i.e. not a compilation of already known publications) and the manner of its presentation complies with the rules for citing published work;
6. Whether the research methods have been selected, applied and described appropriately;
7. To what extent the interpretation is relevant to the results;
8. Whether the conclusions have been well documented and the results contribute new elements to scientific knowledge;
9. Whether the considerations included in the study are clear and logical and the structure of the study is clear, coherent and consistent;
10. Whether the study is written in a correct, professional and understandable language and the illustrations included in the work (tables, figures, diagrams, etc.) have been correctly elaborated and presented;

11. To what extent the issues covered in the study can be used in research practice or for the development of scientific theory;
12. To what extent the issues covered in the study are useful for the development of the education system or for social development;
13. Whether the Reviewer has identified any ethical violations, conflicts of interest, or other deficiencies that may disqualify the study.

### Detailed list of recommended changes

#### Statement

I, the undersigned ..... hereby declare that the editors of the FRSE Research & Publishing Unit have not informed me of the personal details of the Author/ Authors of the reviewed text, nor of the other Reviewer of the article. If, by chance, it should turn out that on the basis of the content of the article or other indications I have gained a justified conviction as to the identity of the Author(s), I declare that:

- there is no conflict of interest between us, neither in the form of direct personal relations, nor in the form of reporting relationships, nor in the form of direct scientific cooperation in the last three years.
- there is a conflict of interest between us in the form of direct personal relations, reporting relationships or direct scientific cooperation in the last three years.

Date and signature of the reviewer .....