

PROCEDURE FOR REVIEWING SCIENTIFIC TEXTS TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE SCIENTIFIC JOURNAL *PRZEGLĄD RYNKU FINANSOWEGO – FINANCIAL SUPERVISION REVIEW*

1. A scientific text (a scientific article, gloss, review) which meets the formal and technical requirements and has been pre-approved by the Editorial Committee for publication in accordance with the programme objectives and recommendations of the Programme Board, and has been checked with the use of the Antyplagiat system, shall be submitted for external review.
2. The review process does not apply to source texts, in particular to research communications, resolutions of the KNF Board, positions of the KNF Board and the UKNF, or to any other materials, if they comply with the purpose of publishing in the scientific journal.
3. The Editor-in-Chief shall request that the scientific text be reviewed by two external Reviewers independently, ensuring that the selection of Reviewers precludes any suspicion of bias or self-interest. In particular, the role of Reviewer shall not be assigned to any person who reports directly to the Author. A Reviewer shall not be affiliated with the same institution as the Author of the scientific text.
4. The review shall be a double-blind review process, which means that the scientific text shall be submitted to the Reviewer after being anonymised, and the Reviewer's name shall not be disclosed to the Author. Names of Reviewers may only be disclosed collectively as a list, without indicating which texts have been reviewed by a given Reviewer.
5. A Reviewer shall express a final conclusion of the review by stating that the review is:
  - 1) positive, or
  - 2) positive with reservations, or
  - 3) negative
6. A scientific text may be published if both reviews are positive. If one or both reviews are positive reviews with reservations, the scientific text may be published if the Author considers the Reviewers' reservations or provides good reasons for the refusal to do so. In case of doubt, the decision on whether the text should be published shall be made by the Editor-in-Chief, after consulting at least two theme editors or the whole Editorial Committee. Before making the decision, the Editor-in-Chief may request additional review or opinion of a theme editor (internal review).
7. If both external reviews are negative, the Editor-in-Chief shall refuse to publish the scientific text.

8. If one review is positive or positive with reservations and the other one is negative, the Editor-in-Chief shall request additional external review. A scientific text may be published if the additional external review is positive or positive with reservations, provided that in such a case the Author considers the reservations of the external Reviewers or provides good reasons for the refusal to do so. In case of doubt, the decision on whether the text should be published shall be made by the Editor-in-Chief, after consulting at least two theme editors or the whole Editorial Committee.
9. Reviews shall be made in writing or in electronic form.
10. The Editorial Committee may prepare a review form. If such forms are prepared, reviews shall be made on such forms.
11. Communication with the Reviewers and the Author shall be the responsibility of the theme editor assigned to a given scientific text by the Editor-in-Chief, or of the Secretary of the Editorial Team – as decided by the Editor-in-Chief.
12. Whenever this procedure mentions the Author, this shall also mean the co-author in the case of texts with multiple Authors.