

Review process

1. Publishing of papers is **conditioned by a successful peer-review** according to specified procedure that is published. Each paper is reviewed by at least two reviewers; the paper is published in case of two supporting recommendations. Any of the reviewers is not allowed to be a member of the Editorial Board or staff of the same institution as the author or co-author of the submitted paper.
2. **Reviewers are chosen from a number of experts on the basis of their proven qualification in the area discussed in the paper outside the institution where the author works.**
3. **Names of the reviewers are published** when publishing the paper. Before publishing the paper, reviewers know neither names of other reviewers nor names of the author(s) of the paper. Author's name is not known to reviewers.
4. The review process has two stages:
 - a. **The first review** is done by the chairman of the editorial board or by the assigned member of the editorial board. The chairman of the editorial board is authorized to reject the submission or to recommend necessary changes if the paper will not meet the basic criteria of submitted papers (the topic is outside the scope of the journal, it does not respect formal criteria of writing). The editorial board is allowed to require an explanation of the chairman's decision. The first review process does not take more than 3 weeks.
 - b. **The second review** is done by two assigned reviewers chosen by the chairman of the editorial board according to the recommendation of members of the editorial board. The chairman of the editorial board submits the paper to reviewers by the executive editors. The deadline of the review cannot exceed 4 weeks. If the reviewer does not send their review in 4 weeks, another reviewer is chosen with a follow-up term of 4 weeks.
5. The reviewer's review consists of the following parts:
 - a. A review for authors prepared in a standard form (appendix The form of a EWP review) enabling a (detailed) comments.
 - b. A confidential report to the editorial board (not required; not disclosed to authors)
6. The reviewer's decision can be:
 - a. **To accept** (without changes)
 - b. **To accept with minor changes** (not further specified by the reviewer)
 - c. **To revise and resubmit** (the reviewer states what are the necessary revision and suggested changes)
 - d. **To reject** (the reviewer states what are the reason of rejection)
7. The decision of accepting, revising or rejecting the paper is taken by the chairman of the editorial board according to rules stated in the appendix (Rules for accepting the paper according to reviewers decisions).

Rules for accepting the paper according to reviewers decisions

	to accept (1)	to accept with minor changes (2)	to revise and resubmit (3)	to reject (4)
to accept (1)	The chairman of the editorial board accepts the paper for publishing.	The author is asked to implement changes. Further review is performed by two editors assigned by the chairman of the editorial board.	The author is asked to implement changes. Further review is performed by two editors assigned by the chairman of the editorial board.	The paper is send back to the author for revision. New review is performed by the third reviewer.
to accept with minor changes (2)	The author is asked to implement changes. Further review is performed by two editors assigned by the chairman of the editorial board.	The author is asked to implement changes. Further review is performed by two editors assigned by the chairman of the editorial board.	The paper is send back to the author for revision. If possible, further review is performed by the reviewer who has recommended the revision.	The paper is send back to the author for revision. New review is performed by the third reviewer.
to revise and resubmit (3)	The paper is send back to the author for revision. If possible, further review is performed by the reviewer who has recommended the revision.	The paper is send back to the author for revision. If possible, further review is performed by the reviewer who has recommended the revision.	The chairman in coordination with the editorial board decides if the paper will be rejected or send back for revision. The revised paper is reviewed by the same reviewers.	The chairman in coordination with the editorial board decides if the paper will be rejected or send back for revision. The revised paper is reviewed by the same reviewers.
to reject (4)	The paper is send back to the author for revision. New review is performed by the third reviewer.	The paper is send back to the author for revision. New review is performed by the third reviewer.	The chairman in coordination with the editorial board decides if the paper will be rejected or send back for revision. The revised paper is reviewed by the same reviewers.	The chairman of the editorial board rejects the paper.