

## Procedures for External Peer Review Process

The journal *Český časopis historický*/The Czech Historical Review adheres to the principles of double-blind peer review. The review procedure is considered to be a crucial aspect of maintaining high standard of the journal and texts published in it.

### Course of the review process

Sent out to reviewers are all texts submitted to editors as studies. Book reviews, contributions of discussion, obituaries, reports etc. are only evaluated by the board of editors. All contributions are subject to the so called initial editorial decision – two editors in chief (or else consulting the editorial board) have the right to reject without reviewing such texts as are not in agreement with the focus of the journal, do not comply with the basic requirements for scientific text, are ethnically problematic etc.

Besides, editors in chief could require the authors to realize adjustments of contents, linguistic and formal even before submitting the article for peer-reviewing. In case of the author refusing the adjustments, the editor in chief (or else consulting the editorial board) either rejects the article or submits it for review process. The editor in chief could also require shortening of the article or any other adjustments based upon the submission guidelines for authors. The texts for review are made anonymous by the editor in chief and sent out to two peer reviewers, whose selection is sanctioned by the editorial board. The authors and the reviewers remain anonymous to each other throughout the whole review procedure. As peer-reviewers are selected experts in the field. It is also taken into consideration that the referees should not be closely related to the author, in terms of work, institutional or personal relation. The review process results in recommendation to acceptance, revision or rejection of the manuscript. The reasons are given and commented in the part of the review for the author.

Taking into account the reviews (or else after consulting the editorial board) the author would be informed by the editor the results of the review process (acceptance, rejection, recommendations for revision). When revised article is submitted, the editor in chief first decides if the revision is sufficient. If this condition is not complied with, the article could be rejected or returned for revision. In case it is clear that the author eliminated all substantial problems identified in the course of the review process, the editor in chief can accept the article without further reviewing and present it to the board of editors. In case of substantial reworking of the text another peer-reviewing is required. It could be undertaken by the original reviewers or no more than one new reviewer.

In case the author considers some or all recommendations of the reviewers as relevant or suspects the reviews to be biased, he could explain his position in written form to the editor in

chief. The contents of the letter will be presented to the reviewers and also, for the final decision on the publication of the article, to the editorial board.

In case the reviewers don't reach an agreement in some phase of review procedure, the text is handed over to third reviewer. If the doubts persist, the decision on publication is in the competence of the board of editors, or else the international advisory board, whose decision is final. The decision on the publication of the text is done by the editor in chief and confirmed by the board of editors.

## The duration of review procedure

Český časopis historický/The Czech Historical Review is being published four times a year, on March 30, June 30, September 30 and December 30. The latest term for sending manuscripts for concrete issue is, in case of studies, source material and contributions of discussion, six months before the publication of this issue, for smaller texts (reviews, reports) three months before the date of publication. However, the determination of term for publication of contributions and their placing into the issues is wholly in the authority of the editors and the board of editors of the journal.

The standard time of review procedure is three months. The editors of Český časopis historický/The Czech Historical Review aim at abiding by the period of three months. However, they are not responsible for delays caused by reviewers, and the latest period of the review procedure is not prescribed.