

Peer-Review

Reviewing rules

1. The Programme Committee guarantees the transparency of the publication policy and criteria for abstracts or manuscripts. Members of the Programme Committee select reviewers in such a way as to minimize the likelihood of a conflict of interest and avert prejudice to the abstracts or manuscripts submitted. The reviews of the abstract or manuscript are taken into account when deciding whether to publish it or submit proposals to the author for further work on it. The Programme Committee takes a final decision on acceptance of the abstract or manuscript for publication.
2. The title page must contain the name, first name and patronymic of the author, the academic degree and academic rank, the name of employing institution and position held, as well as the e-mail address of the author. The information must be provided in English.
3. Submitted abstracts or manuscripts are assessed in accordance with the blind peer-review procedure. For this purpose, the abstracts or manuscripts are sent to the experts without any identification of authorship, neither the name nor the institute's affiliation.
4. All reviewers are recognized experts in the academic field within which the manuscripts are submitted, and have had own published manuscripts in the above field within the last 3 years. The review process is carried out by both the members of the Programme Committee and external experts. The Chairman and the Vice-Chairman of the Programme Committee make a selection of an expert for review of the abstract or manuscript.
5. On receiving the results of the external assessment, the Programme Committee examines the review to see if it meets the existing criteria. If the review does not give an adequate evaluation of the abstract or manuscript and its publication prospects, the Programme Committee could seek additional review by other experts. If the review contains suggestions for improving the abstract or manuscript, it is forwarded to the author.
6. The Programme Committee sends copies of the reviews or a refusal with the reasons to the authors of the submitted texts.
7. Reviewing is conducted on the basis of the standardized questionnaire:

The importance of the issues to the academic tasks of the conference:

1 = minimal contribution

2 = minor contribution

3 = moderate contribution

4 = significant contribution

5 = substantial contribution to the discipline

The relevance of the research for philosophy, political science and historical science nowadays:

- 1 = almost irrelevant
- 2 = minor relevance
- 3 = moderate relevance
- 4 = significant relevance
- 5 = substantial contribution to the discipline

Author's originality (autonomy) in addressing the issue:

- 1 = low (trivial, unoriginal, "common place");
- 2 = below average (there are some original thoughts);
- 3 = moderate;
- 4 = sufficient;
- 5 = original research, containing a new approach to issue;

The credibility of the hypothesis, coherence and logical reasoning:

- 1 = not convincing;
- 2 = not very convincing (many contradictions);
- 3 = average level of credibility (standard, traditional proofs);
- 4 = quite convincing arguments (in general, sound persuasive, with few exceptions);
- 5 = very persuasive arguments

The reliability of data:

- 1 = unreliable;
- 2 = limited reliability (accuracy of the information causes significant doubt)
- 3 = partly reliable (not differentiated);
- 4 = quite reliable (sufficient data without sufficient critical thinking);
- 5 = fully reliable (complete, adequate and critically processed data)

Appropriate style, accuracy and precision, brevity:

- 1. Low (grammatical and stylistic errors, lacking terminological precision, multiple repetitions);
- 2. Below average (repetitions, no precision)

3. Average

4. Above average (some minor flaws);

5. High.