#### Proposal of the peer-review procedure

The peer-review procedure differs depending on whether the article was submitted by an author on a general, open invitation of the Journal or it was submitted by an author who was individually invited to provide a contribution on a specific topic by the Editor of a particular issue.

#### Articles submitted by an author on a general, open invitation of the Journal

The articles which are submitted by an author on a general, open invitation of the Journal are subject to double review.

Firstly, articles are reviewed by the pool administrator. If the manuscript does not meet journal standards as to the content or form, it can be rejected or a revision might be requested before initiating external review stage.

Secondly, the pool administrator nominates an external reviewer. After the nomination is accepted by the Editor of the issue in which the contribution could be included, the article is anonymized and sent to the reviewer.

If the external review is positive ("article can be published without any changes or with minor changes" or "article can be published with suggested changes"), the review is anonymized and sent to the author. The author is obliged to provide the final version of the contribution within two weeks.

If the external review is partly negative ("revised article should be subject to second revision"), the review is anonymized and sent to the author. The author is obliged to provide the revised version of the contribution within four weeks. The final version of the article is re-sent for an external review.

If the external review is negative ("article should not be published"), the review is anonymized and sent to the author. The contribution is rejected.

# Articles submitted by an author who was individually invited to provide a contribution on a specific topic by the Editor of a particular issue

The Editor of the issue in which the contribution could be included nominates an external reviewer, anonymizes the article and sends it to the reviewer.

If the external review is positive ("article can be published without any changes or with minor changes" or "article can be published with suggested changes"), the anonymized review is sent to the author and the latter is obliged to provide the final version of the contribution within two weeks.

If the external review is partly negative ("revised article should be subject to the second revision"), the anonymized review is sent to the author and the latter is obliged to provide the revised version of the contribution within four weeks. The final version of the article is re-sent for an external review.

If the external review is negative ("article should be rejected"), the anonymized review is sent to the author and the contribution is rejected.

Osteuropa-Recht, Peer Review Procedure (English version)

# **Review Form**

# **Manuscript Title:**

 	 ••••••	 

# **Overall evaluation**

(Please mark the respective box)

- [ ] article can be published without any changes or with minor changes
- [ ] article can be published with suggested changes
- [ ] revised article should be subject to the second revision
- [ ] article should be rejected

## **Character of the manuscript:**

(Please mark the respective box and proceed to the adequate detailed evaluation form)

[ ] scientific article

[ ] report

	Criteria	Evaluation			
1.	Adequacy of the title to the manuscript content	Very good	Good	Average	Insufficient
2.	Aim(s) of the research (is the aim clearly defined? is it achieved?)				
3.	The relevance of the research problem for the discipline				
4.	Substantive and methodological correctness (proper selection of research methods and techniques, their application and interpretation of the obtained results)				
5.	Originality and novelty				
6.	Clear and comprehensible structure of reasoning				
7.	Literature review /adequacy, quality, topicality				
8.	Readability (language, presentation of results and analyses)				

## Detailed evaluation of the scientific article (Please mark the respective boxes)

**Optional justification of the assessment and specific comments** (e.g. suggested changes, shortening of the text, title, etc., brief assessment of the scientific level, structure and language of the article):

	Criteria	Evaluation			
1.	Adequacy of the title to the manuscript content	Very good	Good	Average	Insufficient
2.	Aim(s) of the research (is the aim clearly defined? is it achieved?)				
3.	The relevance of the research problem for the discipline				
4.	Substantive and methodological correctness (proper selection of research methods and techniques, their application and interpretation of the obtained results)				
5.	Clarity and readability (is the reporting function fulfilled?)				
6.	Clear and comprehensible structure of reasoning				
7.	Literature review /adequacy, quality, topicality				

## **Detailed evaluation of the report** (Please mark the respective boxes)

**Optional justification of the assessment and specific comments** (e.g. suggested changes, shortening of the text, title, etc., brief assessment of the scientific level, structure and language of the article):

•••••	 	••••••	••••••
••••••	 	••••••	••••••
••••••	 	•••••••	••••••