Editorial Policies

Peer Review Process
- The peer review and editorial processes are facilitated through an online system (Microsoft's Conference Management Toolkit) and a set of email notifications.
- All submitted papers are subject to a rigorous blind peer-review process by at least one reviewer who is an expert in the scientific field of the particular paper.
- The factors that are taken into account in review are relevance, soundness, significance, originality, readability and language.
- Reviewers who accept a review invitation are provided 10 days to write their review via our online platform. Extensions can be granted on request.
- A maximum of two rounds of revision per manuscript is normally provided. The ultimate responsibility for editorial decisions lies with the Editor-in-Chief. All decisions are final.
- The possible decisions include: (1) Accept, (2) Accept with amendments, and (3) Reject.
- The paper acceptance is constrained by such legal requirements as shall then be in force regarding libel, copyright infringement and plagiarism.
- No research can be included in more than one publication.

Responsibility of Authors
- Authors must certify that their manuscripts are their original work.
- Authors should submit the manuscript in linguistically and grammatically correct English and formatted in accordance with the Author Guidelines.
- Authors are obliged to provide retractions or corrections of mistakes.
- All Authors mentioned are expected to have significantly contributed to the research.
- Authors must notify the Editors of any conflicts of interest.
- Authors must identify all sources used in the creation of their manuscripts.
- Authors must report any errors they discover in their published paper to the Editors.
- Authors should acknowledge all significant funders of the research pertaining to their article and list all relevant competing interests.
- Other sources of support for publications should also be clearly identified in the manuscript, usually in an acknowledgment (e.g., funding for the article processing charge; language editing or editorial assistance).

Responsibility of Reviewers
- The manuscripts will be blind reviewed by one or two experts in order to reach the first decision as soon as possible. They are also asked to declare any conflicts of interest.
- Reviewers are not expected to provide thorough linguistic editing or copyediting of a manuscript, but to focus on its scientific quality, as well as for the overall style, which should correspond to the good practices in clear and concise academic writing. If Reviewers recognize that a manuscript requires linguistic edits, they should inform the Authors or Editor in the report.
- Reviewers are asked to check whether the manuscript is scientifically sound and coherent, how interesting it is and whether the quality of the writing is acceptable.
- In cases of strong disagreement between the reviews or between the Authors and Reviewers, the Editors can judge these according to their expertise or seek advice from a member of the Editorial Board.
- Reviewers are asked to be polite and constructive in their reports. Reports that may be insulting or uninformative will be rescinded.
- Reviewers are asked to comment on originality, structure and previous research: (1) Is the paper sufficiently novel and does it contribute to a better understanding of the topic under scrutiny? Is the

work rather confirmatory and repetitive? (2) Is the introduction clear and concise? Does it place the work into the context that is necessary for a reader to comprehend the aims, hypotheses tested, experimental design or methods? Are Material and Methods clearly described and sufficiently explained? Are reasons given when choosing one method over another one from a set of comparable methods? Are the results clearly but concisely described? Do they relate to the topic outlined in the introduction? Do they follow a logical sequence? Does the discussion place the paper in a scientific context and go a step beyond the current scientific knowledge on the basis of the results? Are competing hypotheses or theories reasonably related to each other and properly discussed? Do conclusions seem reasonable? Is previous research adequately incorporated into the paper? Are references complete, necessary and accurate? Is there any sign that substantial parts of the paper were copies of other works?

- Reviewers should not review manuscripts in which they have conflicts of interest.
- Reviewers should keep all information regarding papers confidential and treat them as privileged information.
- Reviewers should express their views clearly with supporting arguments.
- Reviewers should identify relevant published work that has not been cited by the authors.
- Reviewers should also call to the Editors' attention any substantial similarity or overlap between the manuscript under consideration and any other published paper of which they have personal knowledge.

Responsibility of Editors

- Editors carry the main responsibility for the scientific quality of the published papers and base their decisions solely on the papers' importance, originality, clarity and relevance to publication's scope.
- The Editor-in-Chief makes the final decision on a manuscript's acceptance or rejection.
- The Editors are not expected to provide thorough linguistic editing or copyediting of a manuscript, but to focus on its scientific quality, as well as the overall style, which should correspond to the good practices in clear and concise academic writing.
- Editors are expected to spot small errors in orthography or stylistic during the editing process and correct them.
- Editors should always consider the needs of the Authors and the Readers when attempting to improve the publication.
- Editors should guarantee the quality of the papers and the integrity of the academic record.
- Editors should preserve the anonymity of Reviewers unless they later decide to disclose their identities.
- Editors should ensure that all research material they publish conforms to internationally accepted ethical guidelines.
- Editors should act if they suspect misconduct and make all reasonable attempts to obtain a resolution to the problem.
- Editors should not reject papers based on suspicions; they should have proof of misconduct.
- Editors should not allow any conflicts of interest between Authors, Reviewers and Board Members.