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Abstract

Typically, in scientific publications, peer review processes are used to maintain the quality standards of the research activity and its results presented in manuscripts submitted for publication, to improve performance, relevance and give them credibility. The peer review helps the publisher (editor-in-chief and editors, respectively the editorial board) decide whether the submissions should be accepted, considered acceptable with revisions (minor or major), or rejected. For many journals, all manuscripts submitted are subjected to a double-blind peer-review process, in which the authors and reviewers’ identities are kept secret from each other. The goal of double-blind peer review is for submitted papers to be judged on their scientific merit alone, and thus reducing publication bias (minimizing bias) and protecting identities. The double-blind peer-review model implies that the author’s name and affiliation are not revealed to reviewers, and, in turn, the reviewers’ name or any other information is never disclosed to the author or other reviewers of the manuscript. In order to ensure the quality of the publications, editors require that the reviewers have expert knowledge in their fields of research and have authored a substantial number of peer-reviewed publications. The selection of reviewers is the responsibility of the editor-in-chief, the editors and the editorial board, respectively.

Keywords: double blind; manuscript submission; preliminary review

Introduction

In scientific publications, the peer review process is the current way to ensure the scientific quality of publications, as well as the rules for capitalizing on scientific research in accordance with the ethics and principles of research and publication. Peer review constitutes ‘a core part of our self-regulating global scholarship system’ (Gannon, 2001; Tennant et al., 2017; Emile, 2021).
As Dillon said, “In fact, most scientists will not consider a scientific pronouncement as valid unless it has been approved by this anonymous process, known as peer review” (Gannon, 2001). The role of peer review is to contribute to the improvement of a scientific work and its practical or theoretic impact as much as possible so that after its publication, that scientific contribution will be beneficial to the readers, academic community and interested people, and contribute to the development of knowledge and technology, as well as to the progress of the science and society (Gannon, 2001).

The peer-review process is ‘collegial evaluation’ because the scientific work of a scientist is submitted before the publication of a comprehensive evaluation by colleagues (unknown or anonymous to the author/s), scientists who have professional competencies, significant results and credibility in that field. The process can refer to different types of manuscripts, for example, articles, conference papers, books (Foster et al., 2019). These works, respectively scientific publications represent the most important mechanism for disseminating and preserving knowledge within the scientific community (Fossen, 2020). Although there are many forms of scientific publication, the most important is the peer-reviewed journal (Mack, 2018).

In the case of manuscripts sent to a peer-reviewed journal for publication, the editor-in-chief or/and section editors analyze the new submission in the first selection analysis. If the manuscript meets the general conditions pursued at this stage and required by the journal (appropriate topic as the journal scope and area of interest to the journal’s readers, scientific potential and consistency of research, novelty and originality, editing, appropriate language, non-plagiarism, etc.), the manuscript will be passed to the peer review stage. In this first pre-peer review stage, editor-in-chief end editors can also ask the opinions of other members of the editorial board or referees to determine whether the manuscript deserves to be promoted in the peer review stage.

The peer-reviewed manuscripts are to be distributed to the ‘peers’, in fact reviewers, who must be specialists in the subject approached in each paper, i.e., with the title of doctor of science, with significant competencies and results in a paper field. Any possible conflict of interest between authors and reviewers will be avoided, in order to ensure the impartiality and objectivity of the evaluation.

The selection of reviewers is the responsibility of the editor-in-chief, the editors and the editorial board, respectively. Often this responsibility is assumed by the assigned editors, who are or can be section editors. In order to ensure the quality of the publications, editors require that the reviewers have expert knowledge in their fields of research and have authored a substantial number of peer-reviewed publications.

They invite the reviewers to collegially evaluate the manuscripts without identification data of the authors, and to draw up reports in which to present their opinions and possibly formulate recommendations and suggestions for the improvement of the works. The reviews are critical, but collegial, objective and constructive, even when they recommend/propose reject the publication of a manuscript. The request of the editors to the reviewers, who do voluntary work, for the benefit of science and the scientific community is to formulate their appreciations in a professional, pertinent and very polite way. The review activity is voluntary and time and energy-consuming, but it is also honourable (only specialists with recognition, visibility, professional and scientific credibility are invited to review). It is also a task that many scientists assume as a duty or even a professional obligation for the benefit of science and society. On the other hand, peer review is also an exceptional means of training and professional development. The time devoted as a reviewer to practicing and
perfecting the art of collegially evaluating manuscripts helps enormously in the career because it will ensure the accumulation of a useful professional experience and also the improvement of a scientist’s own works (Dhillon, 2021).

In the case of favourable reviews, the authors will improve their manuscript, respecting the recommendations of the reviewers or responding punctually to all their concerns or suggestions, possibly arguing whether their opinions differ from some suggestions or issues raised by the referees.

Peer review imposes high standards of the research and its results presentation reflected in scientific publications. Undoubtedly, an efficient and professional peer review process will contribute to the improvement and refinement of manuscripts submitted for publication. In addition, it will improve the overall scientific quality of the papers, will contribute to a better understanding of the presented works by the readers, even by non-specialists in the field. Finally, will increase the manuscripts impact, performance, and relevance, and also their interest to a larger audience (Eriksson et al., 2005; Dhillon, 2021).

A well written scientific manuscript that maintains a rigorous approach at every stage, from the initial hypothesis to the design, execution and analysis of the experiments, will ultimately hold up against the scrutiny of even the toughest reviewers (Gemayel, 2016). Gemayel (2016) made a nice comparison, showing that writing a scientific paper is a lot like filmmaking. And just like in films where inadequate framing or editing can ruin an otherwise good script, a substandard manuscript can undermine the communication of a good scientific study.

However, based on the peer review process, we could liken the process of improving a manuscript through the effort of authors following the requirements of reviewers (and possibly editors) with the work of a sculptor who, starting from the sculpted rock more or less finished, gradually manages to better carve, polish and produce a work art.

In the process of publication, the peer review helps the editorial board (editor-in-chief and editors respectively) to decide whether submissions should be accepted, considered acceptable with revisions (minor or major) or rejected.

There are different peer review models, as follows (as described by Dhillon, 2021, in her article entitled ‘How to be a good peer reviewer of scientific manuscripts’, published in The FEBS Journal):

- Single blind; reviewers know the identity of the author(s), but reviewer anonymity is maintained.
- Double blind; reviewers do not know the identity of the author(s) and vice versa.
- Open peer review; reviewers know the identity of the author(s), and author(s) know the identity of the reviewers.
- Transparent peer review; the peer-review history of the manuscript (reviewers’ reports, authors’ responses and editors’ decision letters) is published alongside the accepted article.
- Collaborative peer review; the authors and the peer reviewers can interact with each other directly, usually on a platform provided by the journal.
- Post-publication peer review; the opportunity for review of the manuscript is provided after publication (usually via a discussion forum linked to the published article).
- Transferrable/portable peer review; publishers operate a cascade system within their journals (if a manuscript is not deemed suitable for one journal following peer review, the author is given the option to transfer the manuscript files, together with the reviewer reports, to another journal in the series).
Dhillon (2021) also provided the following ‘Further Resources’, useful for approaching the peer review process by those interested, especially maybe by young researchers:

- http://blogs.nature.com/ofchemesandmemes/2016/11/04/what-makes-a-great-peer-reviewer-tips-from-nature-research-editors
- http://reviewers.plos.org/resources/how-to-write-a-peer-review/
- https://publons.com/blog/peer-review-essentials-for-the-beginning-peer/

For many journals, all manuscripts submitted are subjected to a double-blind peer-review process, in which the authors and reviewers’ identities are kept secret from each other. The goal of double-blind peer review is for submitted papers to be judged on their scientific merit alone, and thus reducing publication bias (minimizing bias) and protecting identities. The double-blind peer-review model implies that the author’s name and affiliation are not revealed to reviewers, and, in turn, the reviewers’ name or any other information is never disclosed to the author or other reviewers of the manuscript (Gannon, 2001; Tomkins et al., 2017).

The initiators of the project through which the journal Nova Geodesia was founded made an in-depth analysis of the peer review models that are used and ensure the best results, reflected in successful and highly scientific journals. The scientific literature contains a lot of papers including different opinions, extremely well-argued for a particular model of the peer review process (Tomkins et al., 2017). The founders of Nova Geodesia considered multiple pros and cons for peer review process, respectively double blind or single blind review, and reported them to the concrete conditions regarding the field and the stated purpose of the journal, the situation of research and publications in the field at the regional level, national and European, the perspectives of the development of the journal and the avoidance of the aspects of bias in the publication. They opined that, in the conditions of setting up the journal, and for a peer reviewed journal at the beginning, the best system of the peers’ evaluation would be double-blind.

Details on the work process proposed in the journal Nova Geodesia can be found in the following annexes:
- Annex 1: Peer Review Process
- Annex 2: Description of the work process and peer review methods proposed to the reviewers
- Annex 3: Journal Review Form
References


Annex 1: Peer Review Process

All manuscripts submitted to *Nova Geodesia* journal are subjected to a **double-blind peer-review process**, in which the authors and reviewers’ identities are kept secret from each other. Peer review processes are employed to maintain standards of quality of the journal, improve performance, and provide credibility. The peer review helps the publisher (editor-in-chief and editors, respectively the editorial board) decide whether the submissions should be accepted, considered acceptable with revisions (minor or major), or rejected. The goal of double-blind peer review is for submitted papers to be judged on their scientific merit alone, and thus to reduce publication bias (minimizing bias) and protecting identities. Double-blind peer-review model implies that the author’s name and affiliation are not revealed to reviewers, and, in turn, the reviewers’ name or any other information is never disclosed to the author or other reviewers of the manuscript.

In order to ensure the quality of the publications, we require that the reviewers have expert knowledge in their fields of research and have authored a substantial number of peer-reviewed publications.

The selection of reviewers is the responsibility of the editor-in-chief, the editors and the editorial board, respectively.

Peer-Review Process Flowchart

The journal uses the platform **Open Journal Systems (OJS)**, an open source software application for managing and publishing scholarly journals. OJS is a comprehensive tool for managing the submission and editorial workflow and publishing articles and issues online, offered with professionalism and generosity by pkp ([https://pkp.sfu.ca/ojs/](https://pkp.sfu.ca/ojs/)).

**Manuscript Submission**: Manuscripts should be prepared following the Author Guidelines and submitted through the online system.

**Preliminary Review**: After the submission, the manuscript goes through a preliminary technical and editorial check to ensure that it complies with the journal’s Instructions to Authors.

**PRELIMINARY TECHNICAL CHECK (EDITORIAL SELECTION)**

At this step the technical preparation of the submission is checked, including the language level, referencing/formatting and authenticity using plagiarism software. In addition, the Author Statement is required! Articles submitted will not be considered without Author Statement (completed, signed with a blue pen, scanned and uploaded as a supplementary file in the submission process) see Submission Preparation Checklist. After the peer review process, if the manuscript is accepted for publication, the Author Statement should be sent to us, as original, by regular postal mail.
PRELIMINARY EDITORIAL CHECK

Before forwarding the manuscript for an in-depth review, the Editorial Board checks if the manuscript is within the scope of the journal, if it contains a high level of originality and if it follows the overall scientific requirements of the journal. Specifically, this preliminary selection considers factors such as the preparation of the paper according to the instructions to authors (Author Guidelines); objective formulation in a clear and coherent manner; theoretical basis; literature review; analysis of data using appropriate methods; discussion of results in relation to scientific literature; contribution to the scientific area; quality of tables and figures; originality and consistency of the research etc.

Manuscript rejected at editorial level If a manuscript does not meet the requirements of the journal (scope, originality, does not follow Author Guidelines, etc.) it will not be forwarded to an in-depth review.

The manuscript can be rejected if:
The journal’s scope is different to the topic of the submitted paper
Presentation of a manuscript does not follow the journal’s instructions for authors
The article contains significant swathes of plagiarized content
The editor judges that their audience might not be interested in this manuscript
The topic of the paper is too specialized/niche (not even as the niche of the journal)
The research is poor. The results presented are too preliminary or superficial
Failure to relate findings / (results and discussion) /conclusions to aims / theory / literature
The quality of English language use is poor

Manuscript accepted for peer review If the manuscript meets the journal’s requirements (both at technical and editorial level), it is forwarded to peer-review.

MANUSCRIPT ENTERS IN-DEPTH REVIEW PROCESS

Editor selects reviewers - Reviewers are selected on the basis of a number of factors such as expertise in the area of research, specific recommendations, availability, previous experience and prior history of providing timely and quality feedback to authors. Invitations to review a manuscript are confidential. Reviewers are asked to examine and assess the manuscript, its research design, methodology, validity, accuracy, originality and significance of findings. Editorial board members and reviewers must treat the review process as strictly confidential, and not discuss the manuscript with anyone not directly involved in the review.

Peer review results - After the reviewers complete their review reports, the Editor-in-Chief collects and compiles their reports and makes the final decision about the content of the review report which will be sent to the authors.

Generally, the decision could be as follow:
Manuscript accepted for publication (very rare, ”perfect paper”; maybe happens for invited articles)
Manuscript accepted with revisions (minor or major revisions)
Manuscript rejected
MANUSCRIPT REJECTED
If the review reports deem the manuscript to be unacceptable, the Editor makes the final decision based on the collected review results and the suggestion of the Associate Editor. Authors are informed that their manuscript will not be published in the journal based on unfavourable reviewers’ comments and the decision of the Editor-in-Chief.

MANUSCRIPT ACCEPTED FOR PUBLICATION
If reviewers suggest acceptance of the article, the Editor-in-Chief makes his final decision based on these suggestions. Authors are informed about the acceptance of their article and that their article will be forwarded to the publishing process (‘Copy-editing’, ‘Layout’, ‘Proofreading’ – see below; more information on ‘OJS Editorial and Publishing Process’).

MANUSCRIPT ACCEPTED WITH REVISIONS
Authors are required to make minor/major corrections to their manuscript based on reviewers comments they have received, in order to make it suitable for publication. (Revised submissions go through the same initial steps outlined above for new submissions before they can be reassigned to original Reviewers.)
Manuscript sent back to the author(s) for revision - Authors should address the referees comments and send their responses in a separate document (Response to reviewers). Once the corrections have been made, authors need to send (re-submit) their manuscript as well as the "Response to reviewers".

Reviewers check the revised manuscript - Revised manuscript, along with "Response to reviewers", is forwarded to original reviewers who are then asked to review the manuscript again, for their final decision.

MANUSCRIPT ACCEPTED FOR PUBLICATION
Should the reviewers find that no further revision is necessary for the manuscript, it is accepted "as is" and forwarded for the editing process.

MANUSCRIPT REJECTED
Should the reviewers find that the manuscript is still not suitable for publication, it is rejected and further processing is discontinued.

Editor confirms final decision - Review reports are sent to authors.
Annex 2: Description of the work process and peer review methods proposed to the reviewers

Guidelines for Reviewers

A short note appears before describing how to work in the peer review process:

The voluntary work of the reviewers for the benefit of science is the highest form of awareness of the role and mission of the scientists, but also of their human quality. Rigorous peer-review is the cornerstone of high-quality academic publishing. We are extremely grateful to the reviewers who give their time and effort to peer-review articles submitted to our journal.

Your contributions to increasing the quality, visibility and recognition of our journal are highly appreciated, thank you!

Editor-in-Chief

The journal uses a double-blind review, which means that both the reviewer and author identities are reciprocal concealed throughout the review process.

The general purpose of the peer review is to assist the editors in evaluating the worthiness of the manuscripts for publication and to help the authors in improvements of their work. If the evaluations at some point(s) are negative, the reviewers are asked to provide clear arguments. The reviewers are asked to have an honest, critical but polite, collegial and constructive attitude, appreciating as much as possible the work of the authors and offering them support in order to increase the quality of the manuscripts.

Reviewers can download the manuscript, kept by us as a Word file, in the next step (3. Download & Review) and evaluate the manuscript as they wish, for example:

- Possibility 1. Analyse the manuscript and after that enter (or paste) the review of the analysed submission into the 'Review' box in the next step (3. Download & Review). To proceed to the next step, click "Continue to Step #3" at the bottom of this page. In this step, except the box "For author and editor" (where the reviewer can present the report, without his/her name) there is also a box "For editor only" (where the reviewers can include their own opinions about the manuscript only for the editor, which will not be known by the authors).

- Possibility 2. Analyse the manuscript, and make some corrections (suggestions, recommendations, comments) directly within the manuscript, using Track Changes. Please do not forget to delete your identification data before uploading the Word file with the review [File - Info - Check for issues - Inspect document - Document inspector - click/activate only 'Document Properties and Personal Information' - click 'Inspect' - Remove All - Close - Save]. If the reviewers do not hide their own identification data from the Word file (they forgot or they are not able to do it), we will do it.
Possibility 3. Analyse the manuscript and after that enter (or paste) your comments (suggestions etc.) into the ‘Journal Review Form’ (see below the content), or Annex 3 in this document. ‘Journal Review Form’ can be downloaded as a Word file from here (downloads .docx file). The form can be used to complete it according to the entire model, or it can be completed as much as reviewers desired (e.g. only ‘overview’ table, suggestions for improvement etc.).

Possibility 4. Use both Track Changes directly on the manuscript (possibility 2), and ‘Journal Review Form’ to mark all the necessary comments or changes (possibility 3), and uploaded them back on the e-platform. You can upload your files in Step 3 (using ‘Reviewer Files’), and you can use also ‘Review Discussions’ for additional matters.
Annex 3: Journal Review Form

Instructions: The journal is committed to high academic standards, treating publication as a collaborative process between Author, Reviewers and Editors. The goal of the peer review process is to improve the academic and scientific quality of the submissions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nr</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Below average</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Does the title of the paper clearly reflect its contents?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Is the abstract sufficiently informative, covering all sections, e.g. purpose, technical approach, results, and conclusion / recommendation?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Does the introduction state the scientific problem clearly?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Is the description of materials and methods sufficiently informative to allow replication of the experiment?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Are the statistical methods used correctly and adequately?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Are the experimental results consistent scientifically and/or practically? Are they sufficient to justify the conclusions?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Are the results properly presented and the manuscript is adequately discussed (concise and tightly argued)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Does the paper make a significant new contribution to the advancement of knowledge or towards a better understanding of existing concepts?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Is the content of the manuscript acceptable and the article structured in agreement with instructions to authors?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Do the tables and figures contain relevant results and information? Are they adequately described (units, definitions, abbreviations) and self-explanatory?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Are the references adequate and properly chosen?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Does the English language require improvement?</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GENERAL COMMENTS**

**Subject**
The topic of the paper: is relevant, timely, and of interest to the audience of the journal?
Reviewer comment:

**Originality**
Is the article sufficiently novel and interesting to warrant publication? Does it add to the canon of knowledge? Does the article adhere to the journal’s standards? Is the research question an important one?
Reviewer comment:

**Structure**
Is the article clearly laid out? Are all the key elements (where relevant) present: abstract, introduction, methodology, results, conclusions? Consider each element in turn:

- **Title**: Does it clearly describe the article?
  Reviewer comment:

- **Abstract**: Does it reflect the content of the article?
  Reviewer comment:
- **Introduction**: Does it describe what the author hoped to achieve accurately, and clearly state the problem being investigated? Normally, the introduction should summarize relevant research to provide context and explain what other authors’ findings, if any, are being challenged or extended. Describe the experiment, the hypothesis(es) and the general experimental design or method?

  Reviewer comment:

- **Method**: Does the author accurately explain how the data was collected? Is the design suitable for answering the question posed? Is there sufficient information present for you to replicate the research? Does the article identify the procedures followed? Are these ordered in a meaningful way? If the methods are new, are they explained in detail? Was the sampling appropriate? Have the equipment and materials, experimental techniques (statistical methods) been adequately and correctly described? Does the article make it clear what type of data was recorded; has the author been precise in describing measurements?

  Reviewer comment:

- **Results**: Does the author(s) explain clearly laid out and in a logical sequence what he/she/they discovered in the research? You will need to consider if the appropriate analysis has been conducted. Are the statistics correct? If the ‘Discussion’ is in a separate section, the interpretation of results should not be included here.

  Reviewer comment:

- **Discussion/ Conclusions / Recommendations**: Are the claims in this section supported by the results, do they seem reasonable? Have the authors indicated how the results relate to expectations and earlier research? Does the article support or contradict previous theories? Does the conclusion explain how the research has moved the body of scientific knowledge forward? It seems reasonable if in discussion or conclusion the author(s) indicate how the results relate to expectations if the article support or contradict previous theories, the contribution to scientific knowledge, eventually recommendations.

  Reviewer comment:

**Language**

If an article is poorly written due to grammatical errors, while it may make it more difficult to understand science, you do not need to correct the English. You should bring this to the attention of the editor, however.

Reviewer comment:
Finally, on balance, when considering the whole article, do the figures and tables inform the reader, are they an important part of the story? Do the figures describe the data accurately? Are they consistent, e.g. bars in charts are the same width, the scales on the axis are logical?

Reviewer comment:

Previous Research

If the article builds upon previous research, does it reference that work appropriately? Are there any important works that have been omitted? Are the references accurate?

Reviewer comment:

Ethical Issues

- Plagiarism: If you suspect that an article is a substantial copy of another work, please let the editor know, citing the previous work in as much detail as possible. However, if suspicions are found in the editorial analysis with specialised anti-plagiarism software, the editorial board will take the necessary measures.
- Fraud: It is very difficult to detect the determined fraudster, but if you suspect the results in an article to be untrue, discuss it with the editor.
- Other ethical concerns: For medical research, has confidentiality been maintained? Has there been a violation of the accepted norms in the ethical treatment of animal or human subjects? If so, then these should also be identified to the editor.

Reviewer comment:

Strengths of the manuscript

Reviewer comment:

Weakness of manuscript

Reviewer comment:
### Suggestions for improvement

Reviewer comment:

| Recommended disposition of the manuscript: check one (type letter ‘x’ in the appropriate box) |
|---|---|
| Accept |  |
| Accept with minor revisions |  |
| Accept with major revisions |  |
| Invite re-submission for a new review after major revisions |  |
| Reject |  |

The journal offers free, immediate, and unrestricted access to peer-reviewed research and scholarly work. Users are allowed to read, download, copy, distribute, print, search, or link to the full texts of the articles, or use them for any other lawful purpose, without asking prior permission from the publisher or the author.

**License** - Articles published in *Nova Geodesia* are Open-Access, distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY 4.0) License.
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