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**Guidelines for the reviewing procedure in the “Annals of Pedagogies”**

1. Two independent reviewers, including at least one from outside the unit, are appointed to evaluate each article.

2. In the case of texts created in a foreign language, at least one of the reviewers should be from the language area in which the article was written.

3. The author (s) of articles and reviewers do not know each other’s identities.

4. In other resolutions, the reviewer must sign a declaration of no conflict of interest; a conflict of interest is considered to occur between the reviewer and the author:

a) direct personal relationships (kinship, legal relationships, conflict),

b) professional subordination relationships,

c) direct scientific cooperation during the last two years preceding the preparation of the review.

5. Each review is in written form and ends with an explicit conclusion as to the admission of the article for publication or its rejection.

6. The names of reviewers of individual publications / numbers are not disclosed; once a year, however, the journal publishes a list of reviewers

The review form is provided below.
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Author of the article: ……………………………………………..…………

Title of the article: ………………………………………………………….

When completing the review form, please answer the following questions by ticking the appropriate boxes. In the detailed part of the review (on a separate page, which will be made available to the authors), a brief description of the work is to be written with an indication of its principle and elements of news and comments, especially in those points where the answer is negative or has reservations.

yes no with reservations

1. Does the publication have a logical and transparent structure? □ □ □

2. Does the content of the publication

corresponds to the problem / title of the article posed? □ □ □

3. Are the presented results original? □ □ □

4. Is the list of literature representative? □ □ □

5. Is the language of the work stylistically correct? □ □ □

6. Are the applications appropriate to the content of the work? □ □ □

**FINAL EVALUATION OF THE WORK:**

The article **recommended** for publication in the “Annals of Pedagogies”

• without amendments □

• with minor amendments (without re-review) □

• with significant amendments (requires a re-review) □

No acceptance for publication in the Annals of Pedagogies □
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