

FRSE Publishing Procedure for Peer Reviewing Monographs

This peer-review procedure applies to academic publications.

In the case of the “EDUinspirations Science – FRSE Monographs” competition, the prerequisite for starting this process is successful completion of the initial assessment and substantive assessment stages described in § 5 of the Competition Regulations.

1. Reviewers may be independent academics holding at least a PhD degree and affiliated with an institution other than the academic unit of the Author(s)/Scientific Editor. Reviewers cannot be FRSE employees or retired FRSE employees.
2. Reviewers may be appointed by the Scientific Council of FRSE Publishing or the Research and Publishing Department, following the principle of preventing any conflict of interest between the Author(s) of the work and the Reviewers, and the principle ensuring the best possible match between the Reviewer’s specialisation and the subject matter of the reviewed work. In the case of research reports or theoretical analyses, the composition of the review panel shall enable obtain an assessment of the selection and application of methodology.
3. Works are reviewed according to the principle of double-blind peer-review. The process of reviewing the work is carried out exclusively through the Research and Publishing Department: 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 reviews.
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 contribution the text makes to the literature on the subject;
 - b. What are the strengths and weaknesses of the text;
 - c. Whether the purpose of the dissertation and its main thesis have been formulated correctly;
 - d. Whether it draws on the latest research findings and whether 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 whether 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. The extent to which the interpretation is relevant to the results;

- h. Whether the conclusions are well documented and whether the results contribute new elements to scientific knowledge;
 - i. Whether the considerations included in the study are clear and logical, and whether the structure of the study is clear, coherent and consistent;
 - j. Whether the study is written in a correct, professional and comprehensible language, and whether the illustrations in the text (tables, figures, charts, etc.) have been correctly produced and presented;
 - k. The extent to which the issues covered in the study can be used in research practice or for the development of scientific theory;
 - l. The extent to which 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:
 - a. the monograph is suitable for publication after editorial changes;
 - b. the monograph is suitable for publication after addressing the Reviewer's comments;
 - c. the monograph requires substantial changes and the Reviewer's approval;
 - d. the monograph is not recommended for publication.
 6. Successful completion of the peer-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 FRSE Research and Publishing Department or a person designated by them returns the text to the Author/Scientific Editor to be corrected according to the recommendations provided. The Author has 3 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 for a second review to verify whether the Author has followed the guidelines.
 8. In contentious situations, the Research and Publishing Department, with the support of the Scientific Council, proposes a method of resolution, guided by the principles of the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE).

In the case of two negative reviews or a negative response by the Author/Scientific Editor to the comments of the Reviewers, the Director of the Department has the right to decline to publish the work.

Review form template

I. Recommendation

Having reviewed the contents of the work titled:

.....
.....

I recommend (*please select one option*)

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

II. Justification of the decision

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

1. What new and important contribution the text makes to the literature on the subject;
2. What are the strengths and weaknesses of the text;
3. Whether the purpose of the dissertation and its main thesis have been formulated correctly;
4. Whether it draws on the latest research findings and whether 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 whether 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. The extent to which the interpretation is relevant to the results;
8. Whether the conclusions are well documented and whether the results contribute new elements to scientific knowledge;
9. Whether the considerations included in the study are clear and logical, and whether the structure of the study is clear, coherent and consistent;
10. Whether the study is written in a correct, professional and comprehensible language, and whether the illustrations in the text (tables, figures, charts, etc.) have been correctly produced and presented;
11. The extent to which the issues covered in the study can be used in research practice or for the development of scientific theory;
12. The extent to which 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.

III. Detailed list of recommended changes

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

Declaration

I, the undersigned

hereby declare that the editors of the FRSE Research and Publishing Department have not informed me of the personal details of the Author(s) of the reviewed text, nor of the other Reviewer of the article. Should it inadvertently become apparent, on the basis of the content of the article or other indications, that I have formed a justified belief as to the identity of the Author(s), I declare that:

- there is no conflict of interest between us, whether in the form of direct personal relations, relationships of professional subordination, or direct scientific cooperation within the last 3 years.
- there is a conflict of interest between us in the form of direct personal relationships, relationships of professional subordination, or direct scientific cooperation within the last 3 years.

.....

Date and signature of the reviewer