

Peer Review Procedure

The WSB-DSW Merito Scientific Publishing House ensures that all published works meet the highest substantive, methodological, and editorial standards. A key element in verifying the substantive value of submitted works is an independent, reliable, and objective peer review. This procedure is based on the guidelines of the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) and best practices in scientific publishing.

Eligibility and Formal Assessment

All submitted scientific texts are subject to a peer review procedure.

- The process begins with an initial evaluation by the Publishing House's editorial team, which verifies the completeness of the materials and compliance with the publishing profile.
- A condition for submitting a text for further review is that the Author submits signed ethical declarations, including a declaration of originality and a declaration regarding the use or non-use of artificial intelligence (AI) tools.
- Manuscripts that successfully pass the formal review process are submitted to the Publishing Board, which assesses their substantive value and innovative approach to the topic and decides whether the text will proceed to the appropriate stage of peer review.

Principles of Review Preparation and Selection of Reviewers

Independent external reviewers, recognized specialists in the given scientific field, are appointed to evaluate each scientific publication.

- The Publisher refers the work to reviewers with at least a postdoctoral degree or the title of professor, ensuring that they are not employed by universities in the Merito Group or the Author's institution.
- The principle of preventing conflicts of interest is applied when appointing reviewers, which excludes individuals with close personal relationships, professional subordination, or direct scientific collaboration within the last three years.
- The review must be in writing and assess the level of substantive merit, the originality of the proposed theses, the validity of the research, methodological correctness, and the presentation of the conclusions.
- Each review must be honest, constructive, free from personal criticism of the Author, and conclude with a clear recommendation to accept the work for publication unchanged, with corrections, or to reject it.
- The personal characteristics, religion, background, or political beliefs of the authors must not in any way influence the evaluation process or the outcome of the review.

Process Coordination and Confidentiality Standards

The Publisher fully coordinates the review process, ensuring the highest standards of discretion and timeliness.

- The entire review process is strictly confidential, and the content and conclusions of the review remain confidential to third parties and the Author until a complete set of documents is collected. • Reviewers are obligated to maintain the confidentiality of the reviewed work, may not share the manuscripts with third parties, and may not use the research contained therein before the book's official publication.
- To protect scientific integrity and copyright, reviewers agree not to submit manuscripts or portions thereof to artificial intelligence (AI) systems or other automated content generation tools. • After the expert review is completed, the Publisher forwards the reviews to the Author, who is obligated to address the comments and make timely corrections. If the reviewer's suggestions are not agreed upon, the Publisher provides a written justification.
- Receiving two positive reviews constitutes the basis for signing a publishing contract and submitting the book for publication. In comparison, two negative reviews mean the work is rejected, and the process is terminated.
- In the event of extremely divergent scientific reviews, the Publishing Board decides on further procedural steps or appoints an additional reviewer.