Turiba University
Registration number of educational institutions 3343800213
68 Graudu street, Riga, LV – 1058, Latvia
Phone: (+371) 67622551, 67619008, fax: 67619152, e-mail: turiba@turiba.lv
www.turiba.lv

STATEMENT OF PEER REVIEW POLICIES

Scientific articles received by the journal are evaluated by internal and external experts.

The journal adopted a double-way blind review, which means that both the reviewer and author identities are concealed from the reviewers, and vice versa, throughout the review process.

Initial check

Upon receipt of the manuscript, technical editor check:

- compliance of the material with the profile of the journal;
- design and structure;
- compliance of work with ethical standards;
- uniqueness of the article through a specialized service TURNITIN.

At the stage of initial verification, the article can be returned to the authors for revision. Articles suitable for further review are sent for the first review to the chief editor, who determines the scientific value of the manuscript and appoints reviewers.

Peer review

Reviewing of articles is carried out by members of the editorial board of the journal, as well as external experts from among the leading experts in this field who work in scientific fields that are relevant to the topic of the article and have published over the past 3 years on the subject of the reviewed article. The ethical aspects of reviewing are outlined in the *Responsibility of Reviewers section.*

When evaluating an article and writing a review, reviewers adhere to the following criteria:

- relevance of the topic;
- originality of work, novelty of the data obtained;
- the completeness and accuracy of the presentation of the problem in the literature review;
- clarity of presentation of the goals and objectives of the work, their compliance with the presented factual material;
- completeness of the description of materials and methods;
- the adequacy of the choice of research methods;
- adequacy of statistical analysis;
- compliance of the results with the stated objectives of the study;
- availability of an assessment of the received data;
- validity of conclusions;
- scientific significance of the results of work;
- practical significance of the results of work;
- visual presentation of the material (the presence of tables, figures);
- the presence of a comparison of own data with literature data;
- availability of necessary links to all relevant publications on the topic of work;
- the quality of the resume and the correct choice of keywords;
- compliance of work with ethical standards;
- the correctness of the reflection of results in conclusions or conclusions, if any.

In order to get the most complete and objective response to the article, the editors developed a peer-review questionnaire with a list of issues that the reviewer should evaluate the coverage of in the article. Based on this assessment, the reviewer makes his conclusion about the fate of the article:

a) the article is recommended for publication in its current form;

b) the article is recommended for publication, taking into account the correction of deficiencies noted by the reviewer;

c) it is recommended to transfer the article for additional review to another specialist;

d) reject the publication.

The average review period is 3 weeks. This period is controlled by the editors; depending on the situation and at the request of the reviewer, it can be extended.

A positive review is not sufficient to publish an article. The final decision on the advisability of publication is made by the editorial board on the basis of the validity of the work and its relevance to the subject of the journal. In conflict situations, the decision is made by the chief editor.

The original reviews are kept in the journal for 5 years.

Correction of the article

The editors are in correspondence with the author indicated in the cover letter as the contact author. If the review contains recommendations for correcting and finalizing the article, the editorial board sends the contact reviewer a comment with a proposal to take into account the comments when preparing a new version of the article or to refute reasonably (partially or completely).

Finalization of the article should not take more than 1 month from the moment of sending a message to the authors about the need for changes. The article finalized by the author is re-sent for review.

If the author and the reviewer have encountered insoluble contradictions regarding the article, the editorial board has the right to send the article to another reviewer. In conflict situations, the article may be referred to one of the members of the editorial board. The final decision in such cases is made by the editor-in-chief.

Refusal to correct article

In case of refusal to finalize the materials, the authors must notify the editors in writing about their refusal to publish the article. If the authors do not return the revised version after 1 month from the day the review was sent, even if there is no message from the authors about the refusal to finalize the article, the editors remove it from the register.

Publication denied

The decision to refuse publication of the manuscript is made by the editor-in-chief and the editorial board in accordance with the recommendations of the reviewers. An article not recommended for publication is not reviewed again.

Appeal

Authors have the right to appeal editorial decisions regarding the adoption or rejection of articles:

1. In case of disagreement of the author with the decision regarding the acceptance or rejection of the article, the author contacts the editorial office of the journal in writing indicating the reasons for the appeal.

2. The conflict resolution commission of the relevant journal shall consider the author's appeal.

3. A change of decision regarding an article is possible in the following cases:

- the author provided additional material to the manuscript, which was not taken into account during the initial review of the article;

- the author provided information about the conflict of interest, which was not provided during the initial review of the article;
- the author is concerned about biased reviews.

4. If there are sufficient grounds, the conflict resolution committee of the relevant journal makes a proposal to amend or uphold the initial decision regarding the publication of the article.

5. If necessary, the editors can attract an additional reviewer to make a final decision.

6. The decision following the review of the initial decision is final and is not subject to re-appeal.

Reviewers Responsibility

Reviewers are required to:

- agree to review only those manuscripts for the evaluation of which they have sufficient knowledge and which they can review in a timely manner;
- provide the magazine with accurate and truthful information about their personal and professional knowledge and experience;
- respect the confidentiality of the review and not disclose any details of the manuscript or review during or after the review to anyone, except those who are allowed to;
- not use the information obtained during the review for their own benefit or the benefit of other persons or organizations, for causing harm to other persons or to discredit other persons;
- declare all possible conflicts of interest and seek advice in the journal if you are not sure whether the situation is a conflict of interest or not;
- do not allow the content of the review to be influenced by the origin of the manuscript, nationality, religious affiliation, political or other views of the authors, or commercial considerations;
- maintain objectivity and constructiveness by refraining from hostile or inflammatory statements, as well as from slanderous or derogatory comments;
- Be aware that attempting to impersonate another person while reviewing is a serious violation of appropriate behavior.

All reviewers are encouraged to review the full text of COPE ethical review guidelines for reviewers on the journal's website.

Author's Responsibilities

By submitting an application for publication of an article in the journal, the authors confirm that the publication is designed in accordance with the requirements for the design of articles published on the journal's website.

Authors should understand that an article may be rejected if the following conditions are not met:

- the published study should be conducted in accordance with ethical and legal standards;
- authors should state the results of their work clearly, honestly, without falsification and juggling of data;
- researchers should endeavor to describe the methodology for performing work clearly and unambiguously so that their results can be confirmed by others;
- authors should strictly ensure that the proposed work contains original material, is not plagiarized and has not been published previously;
- authors are required to provide information on commercial organizations that supported the research or publication, and on any other conflicts of interest that may affect the content of the manuscript.