The review rules applicable in PHR

All materials published in the Quarterly are reviewed. This is not just conference materials, information or complementary ones. The reviewers of works sent in for qualification to publication in Polish Hyperbaric Research are academics who are not associated with the Centre / Centres, from which the work comes from. As far as possible, that rule is applied for Reviewers not to have previously worked with the author, and not had had joint publications etc. For every job there are two Reviewers appointed, traditionally one of the members of the Scientific Council and the other from outside. When selecting Reviewers we take into account their past achievements and compliance of the Reviewer’s fields of knowledge with the material provided for evaluation. Reviewers of works submitted by the persons holding the title of engineer, doctor, master and also works submitted by students are independent academics, or people with a PhD. If even one person from the team of authors of the work is an independent academic the work is reviewed by independent academics. The authors of the works do not know the identity of Reviewers and also the Reviewers are not informed from whom the request for a second review is directed. The list of persons reviewing articles for a period of two years is published in the last (fourth) issue of PHR in odd years. In the case of works from outside the Poland, one of the reviewers is always affiliated to a scientific institution outside Poland. Each review is prepared in writing on the form shown below.

In point 1. Evaluation of scientific publication. Reviewer makes its qualitative evaluation by selecting the appropriate box in the right column of the table with respect to each of the five analyzed features. In contrast, below there is a box for quantitative evaluation in the range of 0 - 55 pts. Here the Reviewer, in accordance with their conviction and the current state of knowledge regarding the scope and content of the publication, shall separately from the table above, perform their quantitative assessment. Point 2. Classification of publications. Publication classified by the Reviewer is classified into one of four classes. Point 3 is the Descriptive rating ending the opinion of the Reviewer whether the publication is suitable for printing, suitable for printing after being corrected or is not suitable for printing. The full review has the influence on the decision to publish the submitted material given to the Editor. Most willingly published articles are those with basic characteristics of a scientific publications. However, in the case of evaluation of scientific value the articles taken into account are those which are characterized by a score of two reviews above 25 points and a large cognitive value and significance for science, teaching or practice. If one Reviewer considers the work as not suitable for publication, the work is not published. After the review the author shall be forwarded with all the comments from the reviewer, if they are critical and the material needs to be improved before publication, the author makes substantive amendments, and editing amendments are done by the editors in consultation with the author.

Instructions for Reviewer:

http://www.phr.net.pl/instrukcjarecenzent.php