

### Review Process.

Each article/ manuscript submitted will be accepted or rejected according to the originality, contribution to the state of the art in the field, the fitness to the scope of the Journal, quality of content, and presentation of the submitted manuscript.

The Journal relies on an open and transparent review process. Submitted manuscripts are posted on the journal's website and are publicly available. In addition to solicited reviews selected by members of the editorial board, public reviews and comments are welcome by any researcher and can be uploaded using the journal website. All reviews and responses from the authors are posted on the journal homepage. All involved reviewers and editors will be acknowledged in the final printed version. While we strongly encourage reviewers to participate in the open and transparent review process it is still possible to submit anonymous reviews.

All manuscripts will be assigned to at least two qualified reviewers through few steps described below. Decisions will be made as rapidly as possible, and the journal strives to return reviewers' comments to authors within 2-12 weeks.

On receiving an article, we will pre-screen your manuscript in 1 week. The editor in charge of the manuscript will check whether the manuscript is valid, does fall into the scope of the Journal, the presentation language is fluent, and the contribution to the state of the art is clear.

Following is a formal review process accomplished by external anonymous reviewers. Please note that the final decision on the acceptance / rejection of your manuscript is upon the Editor or one of the Associate Editors.

**Manuscript Submission** – The manuscript is assigned to one of the Associated Editors.

*Pre-reviewing (Editorial Reviewing)* – Initial Screening of the Manuscript – the Manuscript can be rejected or forwarded to the peer review process. A Reject decision can be immediately reached if the anti-plagiarism software does show a non-satisfactory score.

*Peer Review* – External Anonymous Reviewers are assigned. Reviewer's reports are collected by at the Editorial Office of the Journal. The editor in charge of the manuscript is either rejecting the Manuscript – or requesting a revision from the authors based on the Reviewers' comments.

Authors return their revised manuscript to the Editorial Office. The editor in charge of the manuscript is taking a decision – Accept, the Second Round of Revision, or Reject – the decision is communicated to the Authors. Authors are allowed to perform two rounds of revisions. If Reviewers are not convinced by the arguments of authors after the second round of revisions – the manuscript is automatically rejected. The final decision is communicated to the Authors.

**Decisions** on submitted manuscripts are one of the following.

Accept - The manuscript is suitable for publication and only requires minor polishing; thus, no further reviews are requested.

Minor revisions required - The manuscript becomes acceptable for publication if the changes proposed by the reviewers and editors are successfully addressed.

Major revisions required - The manuscript cannot be accepted for publication in its current form. However, a major revision which addresses all issues raised by the reviewers may be acceptable for publication. The revised manuscript will undergo a full second round of review.

Reject - In its current form, the manuscript is not suitable for publication.

*Step-by-step review approach* suggested:

1- Read the manuscript. 2- Check the data quality. 3- Consider manuscript data significant/ high quality, unique, useful, and complete. 4- Check the quality. 5- Check the publication structure.

The peer review of an article involves an anonymous reviewer taking responsibility for reading and critically evaluating the author's work with the purpose of providing him/her with honest and constructive feedback, i.e. highlighting all the weaknesses and strengths, as well as providing necessary suggestions to enhance its overall quality. It is a highly important part of the article's publication process, since a thorough review can help the author a great deal in polishing the manuscript before the final version is published.

### **Peer-review.**

1. *Area of expertise.* The peer reviewer should make sure that the topic covered in the article matches with the his/her area of expertise, and that his/her expertise is sufficient enough to critically evaluate the work.

2. *Time allocation.* The usual timeframe allocated for an article review is 1- 4 weeks. The peer reviewer should make sure that he/she has enough time to conduct a critical review within the allocated timeframe before taking this responsibility.

3. *Fairness.* The peer reviewer should note that his/her critical evaluation of the work provided should be as objective as possible, honest, and under no influence of external or internal factors, such as religious and political views, cultural background, gender, race, ethnicity or citizenry stereotypes and opinions of any kind.

4. *Review Criteria.* The peer reviewer should pay attention to a few factors when reviewing the article/material provided: - Is the content original enough? - Is it clear and well-structured? – Title, does it clearly convey the idea of the research/article? – Abstract, is basically a summarized version of the article, which should clearly state the problem, the findings, and supporting data, so the question is whether the abstract clearly does that? – Introduction, it clearly state the author's role, the purpose of the research, and provides any context to the findings, which are being challenged? – Methodology, is it clear from the material reviewed what procedure was followed in order to achieve the results? – Results, has the author presented all the findings/results of the research in a logical and coherent way? - Conclusion/Discussion, has the author provided a summary of his/her findings and has clearly stated what exactly has been achieved? – References. - Impact, is this paper good enough to attract the attention and citations?

The whole process of peer-reviewing is strictly confidential so it should not be discussed with any third parties. Please remember to be as objective as possible, hence do not evaluate the work through the lenses of your personal experience, cultural background, or religious, political, and sociological views.