



Description of the peer review process

Before the peer review process

The Editor-in-Chief shall have the responsibility and authority to reject a paper before peer review if he/she deems that it does not meet the basic requirements of a scientific text, including any form of plagiarism, or it clearly lies outside the research fields of public opinion research, sociology, political science, demography, media studies, economics, historiography or related social sciences, or it addresses a subject so narrow (geographically or in terms of research focus) that publication in a specialist journal is justified instead. The Editor-in-Chief has the right to recommend changes to the language, form or content of the manuscript prior to peer review.

The peer review process

Manuscripts submitted for publication are presented for review to at least two reviewers who recommend acceptance of the paper, acceptance with revisions, or rejecting it. The author is notified about the result of the peer review process as soon as the Editorial office receives both reviews. If the manuscript requires revisions or has been rejected, the author shall be informed of the primary reasons for this.

Upon revision, the Editor-in-Chief shall first decide whether a paper has been revised adequately. If this condition is not met, he/she may return the paper for further revision. Where it can be proven that the author has eliminated any and all major problems identified in the peer review, the Editor-in-Chief may accept the paper without any further ado.

Papers which were rejected by both reviewers shall not be published. Papers which were rejected by one of the reviewers (while accepted with or without revisions by the other one) shall be reviewed in the second round by a third reviewer, or by one of the two original reviewers if justified (e.g. by a lack of specialists for a narrow topic). After the second round of review, the Editor-in-Chief shall propose acceptance, revision or rejection depending on the content of the reviews. The third round of peer review is not allowed, unless an exception is justified.



Editorial office - Naše společnost/ Our Society
Public Opinion Research Centre
Institute of Sociology
Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic
Jilská 1
110 00 Prague 1, Czech Republic
tel/fax: +420 286 840 129

e-mail: redakce.ns@soc.cas.cz, <http://cvvm.soc.cas.cz/casopis/o-casopisu>

In the event that an author does not find any recommendations made by the reviewers to be justified, he/she can explain his/her position in a letter to the Editor-in-Chief; subsequent reviewers shall familiarize themselves with the content of such a letter, as shall the Editorial Board during the final discussion of the paper. All final acceptance or rejection decisions shall be made by the Editor-in-Chief. If an author does not agree with the decision of the Editor-in-Chief, the author may explain his/her reasons in an appeal which the Editor-in-Chief shall present to the Editorial Board.

The final acceptance or rejection decision shall be submitted for approval to the Editorial Board. Members of the Editorial Board have the right to consult manuscripts submitted to the editorial staff, including those rejected before review by the Editor-in-Chief. Unpublished manuscripts must not be used for any purpose by the Editors, and must be kept strictly confidential.

Length of the review process

The review process typically takes six weeks from the date on which a version of the manuscript deemed acceptable for review is received at the journal's official email address. The journal shall make every effort to ensure that the six-week limit is adhered to, but takes no responsibility for delays caused by the reviewers.