

PUBLICATION RULES OF THE JOURNAL

Ratio Publica

The Wording of the Publication Rules No. 1/2021

Art. 1

Scope, Aims and Sections of the Journal

- (1) The journal accepts academic theoretically focused texts in the areas of:
 - (a) analytic legal philosophy;
 - (b) analytic political philosophy;
 - (c) application of moral philosophy in law;
 - (d) general jurisprudence;
 - (e) constitutional theory.
- (2) The journal accepts professional theoretically focused texts in the following sections:
 - (a) articles (recommended range: 45,000 to 70,000 characters including spaces);
 - (b) discussion papers (recommended range: 30,000 to 70,000 characters including spaces);
 - (c) review essays (recommended range: 30,000 to 70,000 characters including spaces).
- (3) A more detailed specifications of the sections and the scope of the journal are part of the attachment to these publication rules.
- (4) All texts published in the journal are reviewed by at least two referees. The review process is double-blind peer review.
- (5) The journal does not publish, in particular, texts which are merely an analysis of legal regulation, comments on case law, and news from legal practice. Nor does it publish reviews that are merely summaries of the publication and do not contain a critical evaluation of it.

Art. 2

Accepting Texts into the Publishing Process

- (1) Texts are accepted in electronic form at the e-mail address editor@ratiopublica.cz.
- (2) Texts are accepted in Czech, Slovak and English.
- (3) The author is supposed to send a full-version and an anonymized-version of the text to the editorial office.

Art. 3

Beginning of the Review Process

(1) The Chairman of the Editorial Board shall assess in which of the sections the text is suitable, taking into account the designation of the text by the author. He will also assess whether the text should be submitted for review or rejected. The reason for rejecting a text without a review process is in particular:

(a) violation of the principles of publication ethics;

(b) non-compliance with the scope of the journal;

(c) ignoring foreign language literature;

(d) in the case of a review essay, that the text merely summarizes the content of the publication without arguing with any of its research questions.

(2) If the author of the text is the Chairman of the Editorial Board, the Editorial Board shall authorize one of its members to substitute him or her in such publishing process.

(3) The review process is double blind peer review. The reviewer will not be provided with any information about the author and vice versa.

(4) The Chairman of the Editorial Board shall appoint at least two reviewers of the text and deliver the text to them. After an arrangement with them, he determines the time horizon for the reviews to be completed.

Art. 4

Reviewer

(1) Reviewers of texts may be internal or external members of the Editorial Board.

(2) Reviewers may also be experts on the issue of the reviewed text with the title of Ph.D. (or higher) who were chosen by the Chairman of the Editorial Board.

(3) A reviewer of a text cannot be a person who is in a conflict of interest, which could have a negative effect on the objectivity of his / her evaluation of the reviewed text.

Art. 5

Review Process

(1) After reading the text, the reviewer fills in the review form, which is the attachment to these publication rules, and sends it to the Chairman of the Editorial Board.

(2) The Chairman of the Editorial Board shall choose a third reviewer if the opinions of the first two reviewers fundamentally differ in their evaluation.

(3) The Chairman of the Editorial Board decides whether the text will be published, will be published after revisions or will not be published. This decision is based on the recommendations formulated by reviewers and the Editorial Board.

Art. 6

Editorial Process and Text Publication

(1) In the case of acceptance of a text for publication, the Chairman of the Editorial Board will decide in which concrete issue the text will be published.

(2) After the print data are prepared, the Chairman of the Editorial Board sends them to the authors for author's proofreading. The Chairman of the Editorial Board or a member of the editorial staff authorized by him shall set a reasonable deadline for the authors to make this proofreading.

(3) The text is published in the printed issue of the journal and in the electronic issue in the open access mode on the website.

ATTACHMENT

Specification of the Scope and Sections of the Journal Ratio Publica

Specification of the scope of the journal Ratio Publica:

Analytical legal and political philosophy are perceived mainly in contrast to critical legal and political philosophy.

Application of moral philosophy in law means the application of theories of normative ethics in the field of law. Texts dealing with various philosophical and theoretical issues related to the professional ethics of lawyers are also admissible, but not texts focusing primarily on legal issues related to the disciplinary liability of lawyers or the legal regulation of the exercise of various legal professions.

In the case of analytical legal theory, texts that deal with the analysis of key topics of legal methodology, interpretation of law, and researching of the doctrinal foundations of legal science are especially welcomed. Texts dealing with the theoretical foundations of various branches of law or their key concepts are also accepted. However, it is necessary in such texts for the analysis of theoretical questions to be completely dominant and a significant majority of their scope to be devoted to it. Texts dealing with practical issues in specific branches of law are unacceptable.

Furthermore, critical legal theory, sociology of law and empirical legal science are not part of the focus of the journal.

Specification of sections of the journal Ratio Publica:

Article: This is an original, comprehensive text that presents the original results of a research and has not yet been published in the language version presented. It solves a research question, or critically evaluates and comments on the theory of another author. It must contain a foot-note apparatus, an abstract and a list of keywords. It must not be merely informative or popularizing. The recommended length of the article is 45,000 to 70,000 characters including spaces.

Discussion paper: This is an original, comprehensive text that responds to the text of another author, which was published in the journal *Ratio Publica*. It has not yet been published in the language version presented. The discussion paper must define itself in relation to the research question, the way of its solution, as well as the related argumentation contained in the text to which it responds. It should present the reader with a comprehensive analysis, it must not have the character of a mere gloss, a commentary, a set of partial notes. It must contain a foot-note apparatus, an abstract and a list of keywords. The recommended length of the discussion post is 30,000 to 70,000 characters including spaces.

Review essay: This is an original, comprehensive text, which presents, comprehensively analyzes and critically evaluates another author's scientific monograph. It has not yet been published in the language version presented. It must not be a mere summary of the content of the monograph. On the contrary, most of the review essay must present a polemic with the author of the monograph, or its evaluation. It must contain a foot-note apparatus, an abstract and a list of keywords. The recommended length of a review essay is 30,000 to 70,000 characters including spaces.