

Revision: March, 2022

REVIEW PROCESS FOR TEXTS SUBMITTED TO THE PUBLISHING HOUSE OF THE "REMEMBRANCE AND FUTURE" CENTRE

I. REVIEW PROCESS FOR SCIENTIFIC ARTICLES AND SOURCE EDITIONS SUBMITTED FOR PUBLICATION IN THE EDITOR'S SCIENTIFIC JOURNALS

Refers to the following journals:

Wrocławski Rocznik Historii Mówionej (details at: <https://wrhm.pl/wrhm/about>),
Rocznik Ziemi Zachodnich i Północnych (details at: <https://rocznikziemzachodnich.pl/rzz/about>),
Miasto: "Pamięć i Przyszłość" (details at: <https://miasto.zajezdnia.org/mpp/about>).

Texts submitted for publication in the sections "Articles and Studies" and "Source Materials" undergo a two-stage review process. In the first stage, a member of the editorial team appointed by the editor-in-chief will assess a text to determine whether it falls within the scope of the journal and meets the standards required of an academic text. If it does, a text is reviewed by external reviewers appointed by the editorial team that reviews texts in accordance with a review form and the following rules:

1. Any publication is reviewed by at least two independent reviewers who are not from the same research unit as the author of a given text.
2. In cases of texts written in foreign languages, at least one of the reviewers is affiliated to a foreign institution, but from a country other than the nationality of the author.
3. Author(s) and reviewers do not know each others' identities (the so-called "double-blind review process") is recommended.
4. In other cases, a reviewer must sign a declaration confirming the absence of any conflict of interests; the following relations between a reviewer and an author are regarded as a conflict of interests:
 - o direct personal relationship (blood relationship, legal relations, conflict),
 - o a relationship of professional dependence,
 - o direct research cooperation in the two years preceding a review.
5. A review must be in written form and end with a conclusion of acceptance or rejection of an article for publication.
6. If one reviewer accepts an article for publication and one rejects it, the editorial team will decide whether to reject a submission or appoint a third reviewer. If the third reviewer accepts the text for publication, it is edited.
7. The reviewer's decision catalogue includes:
 - o acceptance of the article for publication without changes,
 - o acceptance of the article after minor or major additions and editing/correction/revision,
 - o acceptance of the article after taking into account remarks indicated in the review,
 - o submitting the article for thorough revision and further review,
 - o rejection of the article.
8. The rules governing the acceptance or rejection of a submission and the review form are available on the website of the journal and in each issue of the journal.
9. The names of reviewers of particular publications/numbers are not revealed; the journal publishes a list of cooperating reviewers once a year.
10. Reviewers do not share reviewed content with third parties.

The article, both at the initial stage of manuscript evaluation, review, as well as at subsequent stages (also after the introduction of changes suggested by the reviewer) is directed to the anti-plagiarism control.

A text is published after a positive opinion from reviewers and after any necessary changes in change tracking mode have been made by an author. Authors may submit a complaint to the editor regarding the authors' substantiated dissatisfaction with the review.

Texts submitted for publication in the sections "Reviews and Discussions", "Varia", "Scientific Chronicle" undergo a one-stage review process. A member of the editorial team appointed by the editor-in-chief will determine whether a text falls within the scope of the journal and meets the standards of publication in a research journal. If it does, a text is edited, or an author makes necessary changes.

II. REVIEW PROCESS FOR MONOGRAPHS AND COLLECTIVE MONOGRAPHS

Texts submitted to the publishing house of the “Remembrance and Future” Centre in a form of monographs or as part of a collective monographs undergo a two-stage review process. In the first stage, a scientific editor appointed by the scientific director assesses a text to determine whether it corresponds with the publishing house's profile and meets the standards required of an academic text, and for chapters in a multi-author monograph - whether it corresponds with the substantive concept and assumptions of a given publication. If it does, in the second stage a text is reviewed by at least two independent external reviewers appointed by the scientific director. In case of multi-author monographs, each text is reviewed collectively as a part of a given publication.

Texts are evaluated by external reviewers according to the following rules:

1. At least two independent reviewers who are not from the same research unit as the author of the monograph are appointed for evaluation of each publication, and in case of a multi-author monograph - reviewers who are not from the same research unit as most of the authors.

2. In cases of texts written in foreign languages, at least one of the reviewers is affiliated to a foreign institution, but from a country other than the nationality of the author/most of the authors.

3. Before being submitted for review, the texts are not blinded, however, the reviewers declare that no conflict of interests exists; the following relations between a reviewer and an author (authors) are regarded as a conflict of interests:

- direct personal relationship (blood relationship, legal relations, conflict),
- a relationship of professional dependence,
- direct research cooperation in the two years preceding a review.

4. A review must be in written form and end with a conclusion of acceptance (as is or following indicated corrections) or rejection of a text for publication. A review of a multi-author monograph should contain both an overall evaluation of substantive concept of a publication and individual decisions regarding each of the chapters (on acceptance, acceptance subject to corrections indicated or rejection of a given text).

5. In case of discrepancies between evaluations from two reviewers (one accepting a given text and the other - rejecting it) , the scientific editor of a volume decides whether the text is accepted, submitted for corrections or rejected.

6. Reviewers' names remain undisclosed to the authors until publication, when their names are mentioned on the editorial page of the book.

Once the text is approved by the reviewers, necessary changes are made by the author and (substantive and language) editorial revisions and corrections are introduced, the text is published.