

## Instructions to reviewers

The Journal publishes exclusively unpublished papers. All papers undergo initial editorial checking to ensure that the papers conform to the scope of the Journal and meet the scientific quality requirements. Following the initial checking, the papers submitted to peer review undergo the double-blind peer review process. This process ensures an unbiased evaluation of papers as the identity of the author remains unknown to the reviewers, encouraging objectivity and quality analysis of the originality, methodology and contribution of the paper to the scientific field. The peer reviewer assesses the originality of the paper and its relevance in relation to existing scientific knowledge in a particular scientific field. The Editorial Board appoints two peer reviewers for each article. If the conclusions of the reviews are contrastive, the Editorial Board may request the opinion of a third peer reviewer. Taking into account the arguments, critical comments and suggestions of the peer reviewers, the final decision on accepting or not accepting the article for publication is made by the Editorial Board. The peer reviewer is expected to provide detailed comments and advice regarding the research and formulation of the results in order to help the author(s) to improve their paper. The assessment of the paper includes an assessment of its originality and importance, its methodological structure and the validity of the conclusions drawn on the basis of the results obtained. The peer reviewer must complete the peer review on time and maintain an academic level of communication when writing the review. The peer reviewer must also maintain the confidentiality of paper-related information, in accordance with the ethical standards of reviewing. If the peer reviewer notices weaknesses in the paper, he should put forward constructive suggestions for improvement, amendment or refinement, offering the author guidelines for possible corrections. After reading the paper, the peer reviewer must give an expert opinion as to whether the paper should be published, to propose a classification if peer review is positive, and offer his opinion as to whether the paper should be amended or refined.

The assessment in the review process implies the selection of one of the offered recommendations for publication. Depending on the assessment of the quality of the paper, the peer reviewer may propose one of the following recommendations:

1. **Accepted for publication:** if the paper is assessed as excellent and is considered a contribution to the scientific community, the peer reviewer may recommend acceptance of the paper for publication;

2. **Accepted after revision:** if the paper has certain weaknesses or requires certain corrections, the peer reviewer can propose acceptance with recommended amendments that the author should make before publication;
3. **Rejected with possibility of resubmission:** the reviewer may propose that the paper be rejected, but with the possibility of resubmission after the author has made certain amendments;
4. **Rejected:** the paper does not meet the minimum quality standards or does not conform to the scope of the Journal.

If the paper is recommended for publication in the Journal, the peer reviewers should suggest the classification of the paper according to the following criteria:

1. **Original scientific paper**
2. **Preliminary report**
3. **Review**
4. **Professional paper**
5. **Conference paper**