

## REVIEWING MODE AND RULES

The reviewing procedure follows the recommendations included in the brochure entitled "Good practices in the procedures for reviewing scientific texts" (Ministry of Science and Higher Education, Warsaw 2011).

1. The submitted texts undergo a preliminary assessment by the editorial team.
2. The editors use the rule of a double-blind peer review, according to which the reviewer and the author are not aware of each other's identities.
3. For each article, an outside reviewer is selected, who:
  - is not a member of the editorial team, the Scientific Board, the unit to which the author of the publication is affiliated, or the entity which the Chief Editor of the journal is affiliated;
  - enjoys an impeccable reputation as a scientist;
  - there is no conflict of interest between the reviewer and the author; the conflict of interest is understood as a direct personal relationship between the reviewer and the author (up to the second degree of kinship, a legal relationship, matrimony), a subordination relationship or direct cooperation in research for two years prior to the year of preparing the review.
4. The third reviewer (super-reviewer) may be a member of the Scientific Board of "Turyzm/Tourism", who has achieved recognized accomplishments in the field presented in the article.
5. The reviewers are obliged to maintain confidentiality in their opinions regarding the reviewed article and not make use of the knowledge it provided before publication.
6. The review is written on a [form](#) and must be concluded with a clear statement whether the article is to be accepted for publication or rejected.
7. The reviewer's remarks are passed on to the author. Rational and substantiated conclusions presented in the review are binding for the author. He/she is obliged to consider the reviewers' recommendations and correct the text. The reviewers have the right to verify the text after the corrections are made. If the author does not agree with the reviewer's conclusions, he/she has the right to present their opinion to the editorial team, in an explanatory note.
8. The decision regarding the publication of the text is made by the Chief Editor, after consulting the Editorial Board and, possibly, the Scientific Board, based on the analysis of the remarks and conclusions presented in the reviews, along with the author's possible polemics and the ultimate version of the text provided by the author.
9. It is common practice that article reviews are prepared free of charge.
10. The names of the reviewers of individual articles are not disclosed. A list of reviewers co-operating with the journal is posted once a year on the journal's website.

[Review form](#)