

- Peer review process
- Duties of Reviewers

Peer review process

Thesis publishes only original work. Articles sent for publication on Thesis go through the following phases of review, within a bias period of approximately 8 weeks:

Phase 1: The article published is evaluated by the editor-in-chief to see if the paper meets the basic criteria of the journal, including: the harmony between the nature of the paper and the Aims and Scope of the Journal; if it has the structure of an article; its length, correct use of APA style and if there is a satisfactory bibliography (over 25 sources). In the event that the paper does not meet the criteria, the rejection is immediate, without being sent to the subsequent stages of external reviewers. The editor-in-chief responds to this phase within 20 days to check whether the work is rejected or sent to the external reviewer stage (the following stages).

Phase 2: If the article meets the basic criteria above, then it is sent for evaluation to external reviewers. Reviewers may also be from the editorial board if the work concerns a board member, international field experts, or other university experts who evaluate the article. The reviewers do not know the identity of the author, nor does the author know who the reviewers of their article are (blind peer review).

Phase 3: Reviewers evaluate the article and then provide the editor with one of these answers:

- the article is publishable without the need for revision and improvement;
- the article is conditionally publishable. The reviewer makes concrete recommendations on what needs to be improved in order for the article to be published;
- the editorial office then informs the author on these recommendations.
- the article is unpublishable (Rejected). If the editorial board receives a positive and a negative review from the reviewers of a paper, then a third reviewer may be requested. But there are times when the editor-in-chief decides to publish or not publish an article if one of the reviewers is more convincing and resolute than the other in what he or she has evaluated. The final decision is made by the editor-in-chief based on the recommendations and comments of the reviewers.

Phase 4: Informing the author of the review process. The review process usually takes 5-6 weeks, but sometimes, due to the number of papers, the complexity of the research presented, the delay of the reviewers, or the article completion / improvement phase, the whole process can take up to 4 months.

Duties of Reviewers

Reviewers play a key role in maintaining the quality, integrity, and credibility of the journal. The peer-review process follows the ethical principles recommended by the Committee on Publication Ethics.

Confidentiality

Manuscripts submitted for review must be treated as confidential documents. Reviewers must not share, discuss, or disclose any information about the manuscript with others without the permission of the editor. Unpublished material must not be used for personal research or advantage.

Objectivity and fairness

Reviews should be conducted objectively and professionally. Reviewers should evaluate manuscripts based on their originality, methodological soundness, clarity of argumentation, and relevance to the journal's scope. Personal criticism of the author is inappropriate, and assessments must be free from discrimination or bias.

Conflict of interest

Reviewers should decline to review manuscripts where conflicts of interest exist, including competitive, collaborative, financial, or institutional relationships with the authors. Any potential conflict should be immediately disclosed to the editor.

Acknowledgement of sources and ethical concerns

Reviewers should identify relevant published work that has not been cited by the authors and inform the editor of any substantial similarity, plagiarism, duplicate publication, or suspected research misconduct.

Use of Artificial Intelligence (AI)

To protect confidentiality and intellectual property, reviewers must not upload manuscripts or any part of them into artificial intelligence or AI-assisted tools. Peer review requires independent scholarly judgment; therefore, AI tools must not be used to generate or assist in writing the review report.

Timeliness

Reviewers should complete their evaluations within the agreed timeframe and promptly inform the editor if they are unable to perform the review.