The peer review procedure

Reviews are prepared in writing by at least two external reviewers (known as peer review). They set out a clear position on whether the article should be accepted for publication, rejected or require revisions.

The written form of the review forms the basis for the editorial decision and enables authors to respond to the comments made. Detailed information on review ethics and conflicts of interest is available in the COPE guidelines.

To ensure the transparency and integrity of the publication process, the editorial board publishes a list of reviewers collaborating with the journal at least once a year. This list is of a general nature and does not assign reviewers to specific articles.

Every scientific article submitted for publication is assessed by at least two independent reviewers with appropriate expertise in the relevant field. Reviewers are selected in accordance with the principles of avoiding conflicts of interest and ensuring the independence of the assessment.

Criteria for the evaluation of manuscripts

Editors and reviewers assess submitted papers, in particular, with regard to:

1. the relevance of the article's subject matter to the journal's scope,
2. the appropriateness and accuracy of the title in relation to the content,
3. the topicality of the subject matter and its place within the current state of research,
4. the originality of the research findings and/or the methods employed,
5. the significance of the results obtained for the advancement of knowledge and innovation,
6. methodological and formal correctness,
7. the accuracy of the terminology,
8. the selection and quality of the relevant literature, the accuracy of bibliographical entries and the consistency of citations with the text.

Editorial decision

The decision to publish is taken by the Editor-in-Chief upon receipt of at least two external reviews. Once these have been collected, the editorial team forwards the reviews to the authors, who are required to prepare a written response to the reviewers' comments.

The Editor-in-Chief may decide to:

- accept the article for publication,
- accept it subject to minor revisions,
- accept the article subject to substantial revisions,
- reject the article.

The reasons for the decision are communicated to the authors. In the event of a decision requiring revisions, failure to adequately address the reviewers' comments may result in the article being rejected. Revised manuscripts may be sent for further review or assessed directly by the Editor-in-Chief.

The duration of the peer-review process may vary depending on the availability of reviewers and the speed with which they submit their reports.