

ETHICS OF THE REVIEWER

Reviewing is the most important component of the scientific communication system, the main tool that formalizes the procedure for recognizing new scientific result in the academic community. The review is the only way for the author to confirm the achievement of a scientific result and to consolidate the author's priority.

1. Influence on the decisions of the editorial board

Reviewing assists the editor-in-chief and the editorial board/council in deciding whether to publish an article, and can also help the author improve the quality of the work through appropriate interaction between reviewers and authors.

2. Performance

All reviewers should comply with the ethics of scientific publications and identify cases of plagiarism and other acts of unethical behavior. In addition, it is the responsibility of the reviewers to provide constructive feedback to the authors of the articles and the head of the editorial office of the journal.

Any selected reviewer who believes that their level of expertise in the subject area of the article is insufficient or does not have the time for a quick review should notify the editor-in-chief and refuse to review the article.

3. Confidentiality

Any manuscript received by a reviewer should be treated as a confidential document. The text of the manuscript should absolutely not be discussed with outsiders who are not related to the work of the journal.

4. Objectivity

The review should be carried out objectively. Personal criticism of the author is unacceptable. Reviewers should express their compelling opinion clearly.

5. Recognition of original sources

The reviewer, if possible, needs to identify published articles that are relevant to the peer-reviewed article and not cited by the author. Any statement that any observation, conclusion, or argument has already been published should be accompanied by an appropriate bibliographic reference in the manuscript. The reviewer should also draw the attention of the editor-in-chief to the discovery of significant similarities or coincidences between the manuscript under consideration and any other published work that is in the field of his/her scientific competence

6. Disclosure policy and conflict of interest

6.1 Unpublished data obtained from submitted manuscripts cannot be used in personal research without the written consent of the author. Information or ideas obtained during the review and related to possible benefits should be kept confidential and not used for personal gain.

6.2. Reviewers should not participate in the review of manuscripts in case of conflict of interest due to competitive, joint and other interactions and relationships with any of the authors, companies or other organizations associated with the submitted work.