

## **PUBLICATION POLICY OF**

### ***EXCEPTIONS. THE EUROPEAN JOURNAL OF CRITICAL JURISPRUDENCE***

#### **I. Peer review process**

1. All submissions received by the *Exceptions* shall be first be analysed by the Editorial Collective which will decide whether the submission falls within the remit of the *Exceptions* as described in our mission statement ('Declaration').
2. If the Editorial Collective decides that the submission falls within the Journal's remit, paper will be directed to two independent peer reviewers in line with the principles of double-blind peer review. If the Editorial Committee considers that the submission is outside the Journal's remit, it informs the author accordingly and does not commence the peer-review process.
3. Peer reviewers shall be appointed by the Editorial Collective from among experts in critical jurisprudence or an affiliate discipline (such as critical sociology, anthropology, history etc.) holding at least a Ph.D. degree. Peer reviewers may be drawn from the Editorial Board of the journal, and the Editorial Collective may call upon members of the Editorial Board to suggest names of suitable peer reviewers. Names of peer reviewers will be published annually without attribution to individual issues. Peer reviewers may be appointed for an entire issue or for a specific article, depending on the expertise needed and availability of peer reviewers.
4. When appointing peer reviewers to review a specific text, the Editorial Collective shall take utmost care to prevent any conflict of interest between the author and prospective peer reviewer. A conflict of interest shall be deemed to exist especially if:
  - 1) the author and peer reviewer are affiliated at the same institution, or have been affiliated at the same institution during the past two years;
  - 2) the author and peer reviewer are working on the same grant project as principal investigator and co-investigators, or as two co-investigators or were working on such a project during the past two years;
  - 3) the author and peer reviewer have co-authored a text or co-edited a volume during the past two years;
  - 4) the author and peer reviewer have close family ties (spouses, partners, siblings, etc.).
  - 5) there is or has been a relation of subjection between the author and peer reviewer, especially that of supervisor-Ph.D. candidate, during the past five years;
  - 6) there is any other personal or professional relationship between the author and peer reviewer, also outside of the Academia, which would

make it inappropriate for the peer reviewer to assume his/her function with regard to that specific author, especially if there is known relation of bias or animosity of the prospective peer reviewer towards the author.

5. If a peer reviewer is appointed for an entire issue of the journal (as provided for in point 3), and there is a conflict of interest with regard to one or more authors who have submitted to that issue, the Editorial Collective shall appoint a different peer reviewer to review texts of the authors concerned, without informing the peer reviewer thereof.
6. Peer reviewers shall use a standard form in which they will unambiguously evaluate, in writing, the following aspects of the contribution:
  - compatibility with the profile of the *Journal*;
  - originality
  - adequate methodology
  - relevance for the development of critical jurisprudence
  - formal aspects: referencing, linguistic quality, structure, abstract, title
7. In conclusion, the peer reviewers shall make an unambiguous choice from the following options:
  - accept as it is;
  - accept with modifications without re-review;
  - accept with modifications under condition of re-review;
  - reject.
8. The Editorial Collective shall establish a model of the peer review form which will be available on the *Exceptions* website. Peer reviewers will be asked to fill the form electronically and submit it as a PDF with their signature in digital form.
9. A peer reviewer who calls for a re-review or rejection must give adequate reasons for such a conclusion both under the headings mentioned in point 4 above, and in a special section at the end. The Editorial Collective shall reject negative peer reviews lacking a proper justification and call upon the peer reviewer to correct her/his review, failing which it will treat the review as non-existent and appoint another peer reviewer.
10. Should both peer reviewers opt for 'Accept as it is,' the paper shall be published without any modifications.
11. Should one peer reviewer opt for 'Accept with modifications without re-review' and the other 'Accept as it is' or 'Accept with modifications without re-review,' the paper shall be sent back to the Author based on a 'modify or explain' approach.

12. Should at least one peer reviewer opt for 'Accept with modifications under condition of re-review,' the paper, following the Author's modification, will be sent to that reviewer for a second round of peer review.
13. If both peer reviewers opt for rejection, the paper is deemed to have been rejected and the peer review process is terminated without appointing a third reviewer.
14. If one peer reviewer opts for rejection, but the other chooses one of the three positive options (including re-review), the Editorial Collective shall appoint a third peer reviewer. If the third reviewer opts for rejection, the paper shall be definitely rejected. If the third reviewer opts for one of the three positive options, the general rules apply and the negative review is disregarded.
15. Following the completion of the peer review process (first or second round) the author shall receive the comments of all two (or three) peer reviewers, duly anonymised. In particular, the author shall be informed only about essential parts of the review without any indications that could reveal the identity of the reviewer. If the paper was accepted with modifications, the author can implement them or explain why she/he does not wish to do so. If the paper is accepted under condition of re-review, the reviewers will receive the paper, after modifications, for a second round of peer review. Authors shall receive comments of the peer reviewers only after all two (or three) peer reviewers shall have submitted their reviews.
16. If one of the members of the Editorial Collective or editors submits a text, the double-blind review process is applied according to the general rules. The remaining members of the Editorial Collective are obliged to apply the standards of anonymity and impartiality. Texts of the members of the Editorial Collective may not be reviewed by members of the Editorial Board of the journal.
17. If the Editorial Collective decides that the double-blind review procedure would be impractical due to the character of the text, self-referencing which unambiguously identifies the author or uniqueness of the topic which only one author in the country deals with, the Editorial Collective will abstain from the procedure and asks the reviewers to submit a written statement that there is no conflict of interest between them and the author as defined in point 4 above.
18. Names of reviewers are never disclosed to the author, even if the double-blind review procedure is not applied as per point 17 above.
19. Peer reviews are to be submitted in the written form, be signed and contain an unambiguous recommendation for publishing or rejecting the text.
20. The list of reviewers of a few previous issues is published on the website of the journal and in particular paper issues.

## **II. Preventing 'ghostwriting' and 'guest authorship'**

1. Prevention of ghostwriting and guest authorship should be an important goal of editorial boards of scientific articles. Ghostwriting concerns texts which were created

with substantial contribution of a third person who is not mentioned as one of the authors or not thanked for in acknowledgements. Guest authorship ("honorary authorship") refers to situations in which the contribution of one of the declared authors is inconsequential or none.

2. In order to prevent these practices, the contributors are required to reveal the contribution of each author (alongside with giving their affiliation and precise information on the authorship of concepts, assumptions, methods, protocols used in the publication). The responsible person is the author who submits the text.
3. The Editorial Collective acknowledges that these practices breach academic standards and will denounce them.
4. If the author's research was funded by a different unit than the unit of the author's affiliation, the author is required to indicate in the first footnote (linked to the title of the text) all the other sources of funding.

### **III. Prevention of intellectual property abuse**

1. If the Editorial Collective or reviewers detect a case of plagiarism, the Editorial Collective will act accordingly to the character and scope of the breach of intellectual property rights. In particular, it will inform the institution of the author's affiliation, scientific associations to which he/she belongs as well as other journal publishers in the field.
2. A detection of a case of plagiarism or other infringement of intellectual property rights automatically terminates the peer review process and leads to a rejection of the text by the Editorial Collective.
3. In selected cases the Editorial Collective may inform the relevant public authorities.