

Editorial

The present journal issue turned out rather unexpectedly to be almost monothematic; that is, if Bronze Age archaeology can be taken as a topic on its own within the field of Classical Archaeology. On top of that, the four papers were written by young scholars, thus adding another layer of thematic unity. Our rigorous peer-review system has turned out to be a useful enhancement for improving the quality of submitted and accepted papers. The peer-review process has also served as a useful tool for identifying and declining the less adequate ones.

The first study presented in this issue is a paper by Monika Matoušková on Minoan iconography, which stems from an excellent B.A. thesis and was praised by the reviewers for the many interesting observations it makes. Papers by Kristina Jarošová and Miloš Roháček are the first major outcome from their respective M.A. and Ph.D. dissertations on LBA Emporio on Chios and Second Millennium metal production in Eastern Aegean and Western Anatolia, both prepared within the project *Along Interface* supported by the Czech Science Agency. Finally, the paper by Rositsa Hristova, presents her doctoral research on LBA pottery from Bulgaria, which she successfully defended at Seoul University in South Korea. Last, but not least, we are also pleased that three out of the four main studies in this issue are by female researchers, complemented by two field-reports, again in a balanced authorship.

At this time, I would also like to take the opportunity to dwell briefly on the discussion over the whole peer-review system in academia. An increasing number of academics considers the process contra-productive by now, serving as a mere tool of peer-hatred rather than peer-review (just consider all the jokes about Reviewer #2). This may partially be true, but I still do believe in the usefulness of peer-reviews. The potential lies more specifically in hands of the editorial team. Careful selection of the reviewers is important, but running a relatively small journal gives the editors the opportunity to interact more closely with the authors. Along the process, there are not only the two reviews (sometimes even more), but also a whole range of editorial responsibilities from us, the *Studia Hercynia* team, which includes fine-tuning the papers and illustrations, communicating tough reviews, and improving the English. I see these responsibilities as an advantage against the large and high-rated journals, which have a considerably less personal approach. Redaction systems, double-blind reviews, communication through contact-forms only – they are all expected to further the goal of objectivity and perceived independent assessment. However, in this way articles become commodities. On our end, running a journal with a relatively broad scope such as ours we strive to publish interesting papers; yet by being based at an educational institution, we also see our role as supporting the next generation of researchers.

Peter Pavúk
Editor-in-chief