

REVIEW PROCESS INFORMATION

Peer Review Policy

This journal uses a double-blind peer review process to ensure the integrity, quality, and fairness of scholarly publication. Both the reviewers and the authors remain anonymous throughout the review process.

1. Overview of the Process

- All manuscripts submitted to the journal are first assessed by the editorial team to ensure they meet the journal's submission requirements and basic academic standards.
- Suitable manuscripts are then sent to two or more independent expert reviewers.
- Reviewers are selected based on subject expertise and are independent from the authors' institutions.
- The identities of both the reviewers and the authors are concealed from each other throughout the review.

2. Review Criteria

Reviewers are asked to evaluate manuscripts based on:

- the importance of the paper compared to published work in this subject area.
- the novelty compared to published work in this subject area.
- if the methods, data, and analysis adequately test the hypothesis and support the conclusions.
- if the methods, data, and analysis are described in sufficient detail to be reproduced by the scientific community.
- if there are any ethical concerns related to the manuscript.
- Potential improvements, for example:
 - The manuscript structure, the clarity of the presentation, and the writing style of the manuscript are adequate for scientific publication.
 - The figures, schemes, and tables are appropriate, of sufficient quality, and properly labeled.
 - The reference list is balanced and gives proper credit to published works. Suggestions for additional references that are relevant to the paper are permitted.
 - The Supporting Information (where applicable) is appropriate.
 - Other aspects need further improvement.

REVIEW PROCESS INFORMATION

3. Reviewer Responsibilities

- Maintain confidentiality and avoid conflicts of interest.
- Provide objective, constructive, and timely feedback.
- Refrain from identifying or attempting to discover the author's identity.

4. Author Responsibilities

- Ensure that no identifying information is included in the manuscript file (e.g., names, affiliations, acknowledgements).
- Submit a blinded manuscript and a separate title page with author details.

5. Editorial Decisions

- Based on the reviewers' recommendations, the editor may decide to:
 - Accept the manuscript
 - Request revisions (minor or major)
 - Reject the manuscript
- Final decisions rest with the Editor-in-Chief, who ensures that the process is fair and unbiased.

6. Conflicts of Interest

We expect all peer reviewers to comply with [COPE's Ethical Guidelines for Peer Reviewers](#), including respecting the confidentiality of peer review; refraining from using information obtained during the peer review process for their own or another's advantage, or to disadvantage or discredit others; and not revealing any details of a manuscript or communications related to it, during or after the peer review process. The reviewers should, under no circumstance, directly contact the authors at any stage of the peer review process.

Editors and reviewers are required to declare any potential conflicts of interest and recuse themselves if necessary.

Reviewers should consider whether they have any conflict(s) of interest that may have an impact on the impartiality of the review. The invitation to review should be declined if any of the following situations apply:

- Close personal relationship or professional connection with any of the authors.
- Financial interests related to or impacted by the manuscript under review or its topic.
- Inability to provide an objective review due to other reasons.