

## **Editorial rules of CB**

### **Authors**

Papers that meet the formal requirements will be submitted to an independent anonymous peer-review process. The author is required to take into consideration the observations of the reviewers and incorporate them into his/her paper, or to make a clear statement about them while justifying his/her potential disagreement. In contestable cases, the Editorial Board will decide on publication. Based upon the peer-review process, the author and Editorial Board are allowed to refuse to publish the paper or suggest that it be incorporated into the non-reviewed section of the journal.

In cases of collective authorship, a significant contribution on the part of each member of the authors' collective is expected in the presented results.

In the case that a paper is accepted for publication in the *Castellologica bohémica* journal, the authors agree not to provide a similar paper to other entities with the intent of publishing it.

The authors are required to conform to the authors' instructions (see *Castellologica Bohémica* - Information for the Authors) and adhere to the system of citation described there. If an author fails to adhere to these instructions and fails to modify the paper to its proper form, the paper may be refused due to a violation of its formal requirements. Upon agreement with the author, it is also possible for the system of citation to be modified by the editorial staff. Nonetheless, in such a situation the author must provide the necessary cooperation with the editorial staff.

The paper must be the original work of the author or the authors' collective, and the author of the submitted paper is responsible in this matter (for more details, see License in the Information for the authors).

### **Editor in Chief and the Editorial Board**

The Editorial Board headed by the Editor in Chief is responsible for the formal and scientific quality of the journal.

The Editorial Board furthermore supports the freedom of speech and is prepared, in agreement with generally respected publishing ethics, to remedy any disputes that have demonstrably arisen during the editing process.

The Editorial Board is informed of the whole course of all editorial work and all peer-review processes. It is also the guarantor for adherence to all the editorial rules listed above.

The Editor in Chief and members of the Editorial Board are required to carry out objective and unbiased assessments of submitted papers. Conflicts of interest must be thoroughly avoided (described in general below in the reviewers' obligations). The Editorial Board must ensure that the criteria for selecting papers for publication in CB are upheld. These are primarily the scientific quality and significance of the submitted paper and also conformity with the scientific focus of the journal.

The anonymity of reviewers and authors is guaranteed within the review process.

The Editor in Chief's competencies include dealing with the remarks and objections of authors against the results of the peer-review process in cooperation with the Editorial Board.

The Editorial Board votes for acceptance for publication in CB. If the number of votes is even, the position of the Editorial Circle is decisive (see below).

## **Editorial Circle**

The Editorial Circle is the scientific guarantor of the *Castellologica bohémica* journal. It supervises the fulfillment of the journal's mission and scientific concept. All issues being prepared for print are presented to its members for commenting, including information on the results of the peer-review process. At the same time, this body can decide on whether to accept or refuse a paper in cases of disagreement within the Editorial Board and helps deal with points of dispute. Members of the Editorial Circle can be addressed by the Editorial Board to select reviewers of certain papers or become reviewers themselves.

## **Reviewers**

Each paper is evaluated with two independent reviews. In cases that the Editorial Board sees fit, it can assign a third independent review.

Reviewers are required to uphold impartiality and objectivity in assessing papers. At the same time, they must not misuse the information contained in the reviewed paper for their personal or other purposes.

The reviewer must refuse to process his/her peer-reviewed evaluation if found to be in a conflict of interest. Conflict of interest is understood as situations in which the reviewer

- may gain financial, professional or other benefit by recommending or refusing the paper for evaluation;
- has cooperated over the last five years with the author or collective of authors on the topic that the paper dominantly deals with;
- is in a close professional or private relationship with the author or a member of the authorial team;
- or if there is a fundamental ideological difference between the reviewer and the author in the fundamental topic of the reviewed paper.

The reviewer confirms that he/she is in no conflict of interest by accepting the proposal to process a peer-reviewed evaluation (see the examples above).