

REVIEW PROCESS

The author submits the article to the Quarterly Editorial Office electronically and is informed about the fact that the article is subjected to the review procedure.

Initially, the article is subjected to formal assessment, including such elements as: title of the article in Polish and English, abstract in Polish, abstract in English, keywords in Polish, keywords in English.

Later, the article is forwarded for review.

The names of the members of the Team of Reviewers are included in each printed issue of the quarterly and on the website of the Ministry of Justice in the Probacja tab as well as on the website www.probacja.com.

The Team of Reviewers consists of researchers with at least a doctoral degree and practitioners – judges of regional and district courts. The principle that the reviewer cannot come from a scientific centre represented by the author of the article and is not a member of the Journal's Scientific Council is respected.

The editorial team assigns two reviewers for each article. The principle that the author and reviewers do not know their identities (*double-blind review process*) is respected.

Each review is made in writing on the “review print”, containing the review of the article and the reviewer's request for admission, conditional admission or non-admission of the article for printing in the Quarterly.

In the review process, the following criteria are being considered:

- the subject of the article in the context of the Quarterly's profile,
- the scientific level of the article.

The work must be original, revealing, written in a communicative and precise language, arguments and conclusions should be documented and embedded in the paradigm of empirical and theoretical methodology.

If the article does not meet the above-mentioned criteria, the Editorial Board may opt out of its publication.

The author receives an email including information on the results of the review and an “extract” from the review, i.e. fragments that are relevant from the point of view of making necessary corrections to the text and the further scientific development of the author.

In the case of obtaining one positive and one negative review, the Editorial Board directs the article to the third reviewer.

The author is obliged to write the “Response to a review” in which the author determines whether and to what extent the remarks of the reviewer have been included or presents arguments for not including them.