

## About Peer Review

### Principles of Conduct and Integrity for Reviewers

The principles of conduct expected from reviewers who participate in the peer-review process for the journal *Challenges and Issues of Modern Science*. By agreeing to review a manuscript, reviewers accept responsibility for adhering to the following principles:

- Reviewers' focus should be on the quality of the research being reviewed. Reviewers are required to base their scientific evaluation of the submitted manuscript solely on its content, methodology, and scientific value, irrespective of the publication history of the authors' previous works or the impact factors of the journals where those works were published.
- Reviewers must ensure that their evaluations are comprehensive, objective, and delivered within established deadlines. The focus of the review must remain on the scholarly quality of the submission, avoiding any influence from personal biases or considerations unrelated to academic merit.
- It is the duty of reviewers to disclose any real or potential conflicts of interest, whether personal, financial, or professional, that may compromise the objectivity of their review. In the presence of such conflicts, reviewers must decline the assignment.
- Reviewers are required to critically assess their own assumptions and predispositions to provide fair and unbiased evaluations. Judgments must be based solely on the scientific and methodological quality of the submission, irrespective of the authors' identities or affiliations.
- All feedback provided by reviewers must be clear, substantiated, and aimed at improving the manuscript. Language used in comments should remain respectful and professional, avoiding personal remarks or unsupported criticisms.
- Reviewers are obligated to treat all manuscripts and related communications as strictly confidential. Any sharing or use of the information contained within the submission is strictly prohibited unless explicitly authorized by the editorial office.
- In all interactions with editorial staff, fellow reviewers, or authors, reviewers are expected to maintain a tone of professionalism and respect, ensuring constructive dialogue during any collaborative discussions.
- Reviewers are expected to uphold academic integrity and ethical standards in research. They should ensure that their evaluations are based on sound scientific principles, avoiding any promotion or endorsement of practices that are not directly related to the quality and rigor of the submission.

### Reviewing Mode

Journals apply different approaches to peer review, determined by the traditions and practices of a specific publisher or academic community:

- Double-blind review — anonymity is maintained for both the reviewer and the author.
- Single-blind review — the reviewer remains anonymous, while the author's identity is disclosed.
- Open review — reviewers and authors are aware of each other's identities.
- Community review.
- Post-publication review.

Most academic journals prioritize the first two approaches — single-blind review and double-blind review. The question of which approach is superior remains a topic of debate. Each method has its proponents, who emphasize its advantages, and critics, who highlight its drawbacks.

The *Challenges and Issues of Modern Science* journal prefers the **single-blind review** approach. We believe this method eliminates pressure or undue influence on the reviewer while enabling them to:

- identify duplicate, redundant, and salami-slicing manuscripts,
- verify the authenticity of authorship and detect cases of guest, gift, or ghost authorship,
- uncover plagiarism and self-plagiarism without the use of automated tools,
- consider the prior context and development of the presented research, thus contributing to a more objective evaluation.

The list of evaluation criteria is designed to ensure the transparency and objectivity of the article review process. Each criterion is aimed at ensuring that articles meet the high scientific standards and requirements of our journal and covers important aspects such as title, abstract, content, methods, results, conclusions, and formatting.

Article evaluation by reviewers is conducted according to these criteria. Familiarity with them will help authors better prepare their manuscript for submission, avoid common mistakes, and increase the chances of a positive review outcome.

## Submission Moderation

When an author submits an article through the OJS system, they fill in the [required metadata](#). After this process is completed, the editor must verify the accuracy and completeness of the submitted data. This is an important step in the editorial workflow to ensure compliance with the journal's requirements.

Authors should understand that all the information they provide is not for internal use only; it will appear on the article's page once published. Therefore, it is crucial to fill in all fields carefully and accurately to avoid any inaccuracies.

If any errors are found, the editor will, of course, provide an opportunity for corrections, but this will only delay the editorial workflow.

## Editor Report (Assessment of Layout, Formatting and Structure)

**Editor Report (Assessment of Layout, Formatting and Structure)** is a tool for evaluating the technical aspects of the submitted manuscript. In this report, reviewers will be asked to respond to questions related to the manuscript's compliance with formatting requirements, the presence of mandatory sections, structure, and overall appearance. It is important to note that this report does not involve any assessments regarding the scientific value (Scientific Evaluation) of the article. The purpose of this assessment is to ensure compliance with the manuscript submission requirements to facilitate the scientific review and evaluation process at the next stage.

### 1 The structure of the article title meets the journal's requirements.\*

- The title is presented in the primary language of the publication.
  - The length of the title is between 6 to 12 words, excluding abbreviations, indexes, and special symbols.
- Does not meet requirements  
 Requires revisions  
 Meets requirements

### 2 Formatting of the author list\*

- The list of authors is provided in the language of the publication, separated by commas.
  - The list of authors is presented as a single paragraph.
  - For each author, the first name is followed by the last name.
  - After each author's last name, there is an ORCID badge with an active link to the corresponding author's profile in the format: <https://orcid.org/0000-0000-0000-0000>.
  - The transliteration of names, when submitted in English, is performed according to the state standard, unless any deviations from the [standard transliteration](#) have been previously agreed upon with the editor.
- Does not meet requirements  
 Requires revisions  
 Meets requirements

### 3 The abstract formatting meets the journal's style and requirements.\*

- The length of the abstract falls within the range of 1800–2200 characters with spaces.
  - The text of the abstract includes all eight required sections according to the [journal's guidelines](#), with section headings highlighted in bold.
  - The abstract is provided in English.
  - The abstract is presented as a single paragraph.
- Does not meet requirements  
 Requires revisions  
 Meets requirements

### 4 The set of keywords is appropriate the journal's requirements.\*

- Keywords or phrases are provided in English and separated by commas.
  - Keywords or phrases are written in lowercase, except for proper nouns, and the list does not end with a period.
  - The list of keywords does not contain unconventional abbreviations or acronyms.
  - The number of keywords or phrases is between 4 and 6.
- Does not meet requirements  
 Requires revisions  
 Meets requirements

## 5 "Contributor Details" section meets the journal's requirements.\*

- The information in this section is presented in English.
- The sequence of information about each author, including punctuation, follows the example in the template.
- The transliteration of names is performed according to the state standard, unless any deviations from the standard transliteration have been previously agreed upon with the editor.
- Information about each author is provided in a separate paragraph.

- Does not meet requirements  
 Requires revisions  
 Meets requirements

## 6 The sequence of the section titles in the article meets the journal's requirements.\*

- The main text of the article begins on the second page.
- The first mandatory section, «Вступ» ("Introduction"), is present and is submitted without a title.
- The second mandatory section, titled «Цілі та завдання» ("Objectives and Tasks"), or «Мета» ("Purpose"), or «Мета та завдання» ("Aim and Tasks"), or «Наукове питання» ("Research Question"), or «Гіпотеза дослідження» ("Research Hypothesis"), or «Формулювання проблеми» ("Problem Statement"), is present.
- The third mandatory section, titled «Матеріали та методи» ("Materials and Methods"), or «Методологія» ("Methodology"), or «Метод» ("Method"), or «Дані та методи» ("Data and Methods"), is present.
- The fourth mandatory section, titled «Результати» ("Results"), or «Обговорення та результати» ("Discussion and Results"), or «Обговорення» ("Discussion"), or as two separate sections titled «Обговорення» ("Discussion") and «Результати» ("Results"), is present.
- The next mandatory section, «Висновки» ("Conclusions"), is present.
- The last mandatory section, «Посилання» ("References"), is present.
- The total length of the article is no less than 5 pages.
- The last page of the article is filled with at least 14 cm of text height.

- Does not meet requirements  
 Requires revisions  
 Meets requirements

## 7 The formatting of bibliographic references meets the journal's requirements.\*

- Each bibliographic source in the «Посилання» ("References") section is formatted according to the APA Style standard.
- Each bibliographic source has an active link (DOI, URI, or URL) to the location of the cited source on the internet.
- Each bibliographic source listed in the reference list has a corresponding citation in the text of the article.
- All borrowed or author's figures, tables, and formulas mentioned in the text of the article have a reference to a bibliographic source from the reference list or an indication of the author's own authorship.
- The list of bibliographic sources in the «Посилання» ("References") section does not contain sources that are prohibited by the [journal's policy](#).

- Does not meet requirements  
 Requires revisions  
 Meets requirements

# Reviewer Report (Scientific Evaluation)

**Reviewer's Report (Scientific Evaluation)** is designed to assess the content of the submitted manuscript. In this section, the reviewer answers questions about the novelty of the research, its methodology, the quality of the conclusions, and how well the results align with the stated objectives. It is also important to evaluate whether the article contributes to the development of the relevant scientific field. This evaluation helps determine whether the article is suitable for publication in terms of its scientific value.

### 1 Title of the Article.\*

- **Focus and target audience:** The title of the article clearly describes the researched problem, is understandable for the scientific community, and is attractive to the target audience.
- **Relevance to the content of the article:** The title accurately conveys the main idea of the article and the content of the research, reflecting the key issues without distortion or shifting the focus.
- **Conciseness:** The title of the article is short and meaningful, without unnecessary words or complex formulations, which facilitates easy perception and memorization.

- Does not meet the criteria
- Requires revision
- Meets the criteria

## 2 Identification of Authorship.\*

- **Signs of misconduct:** The number of authors does not raise suspicions regarding violations of publication ethics, particularly concerning the presence of "guest" or "gift" authorship, as supported by the presented volume of research.
  - **Contribution of authors:** The number of authors is proportional to the volume and complexity of the presented research, indicating a significant contribution from each author.
- Questions arise regarding authors' violations of publication ethics.
  - It is necessary to assess the personal contribution of each author to the research and its relationship to the volume of work.
  - The volume of the presented research indicates a substantial contribution from each author.

## 3 Abstract of the Article.\*

- **Independence and substance:** The abstract is independent and self-sufficient, clearly revealing the purpose, methods, results, and other characteristics of the research in accordance with the journal's style.
  - **Absence of unclear abbreviations:** The abstract does not contain unexplained abbreviations, acronyms, or terms that are not defined in the text.
  - **Integrity:** The abstract does not contain references to other sources or documents, ensuring its completeness and covering all aspects of the research without the need to read the full text of the article.
- Does not meet the criteria
  - Needs revision
  - Meets the criteria

## 4 Keywords.\*

- **Relevance to content:** The keywords are relevant to the subject matter of the article and will facilitate its proper positioning and categorization in scientific databases.
  - **Relevance for searching:** The keywords will ensure effective searching of the article, contributing to its visibility and accessibility for the target audience.
- Do not meet the criteria
  - Need revision
  - Meet the criteria

## 5 Relevance of the Research.\*

- **Timeliness:** The research addresses current issues in the field, as evidenced by a review of the literature from recent sources.
  - **Importance of the topic:** The presented topic aligns with contemporary trends and challenges in the field, supported by relevant data on its significance in both scientific and practical contexts.
  - **Goals and objectives:** The goals and objectives of the research are clearly defined and correspond to the current issues in the field.
  - **Impact on the scientific community:** The results of the research will contribute to the development of scientific thought or methods in the field.
  - **Social significance:** The results of the research raise important questions that may influence public discussions or policies in response to challenges in the field.
- Do not meet the criteria
  - Need revision
  - Meet the criteria

## 6 Practical Significance of the Results.\*

- **Applied Value:** The research results have the potential for practical application in the field; they may contribute to the improvement of processes, technologies, or solutions.
- **Real Implementations:** The study contains specific proposals or recommendations that can be implemented in practical activities, addressing current issues or needs.
- **Impact on Practice:** The results may have a direct impact on improving efficiency or productivity in a specific area, supported by the potential for adapting the research to real-world conditions.

- Does not meet the criteria
- Requires revision
- Meets the criteria

### 7 Scientific Novelty of the Results.\*

- **Originality:** The research results contain new knowledge or approaches that have not been covered in the scientific literature or previously published studies.
- **Innovativeness:** The article proposes new theoretical or practical solutions that may significantly alter existing approaches in the field.
- **Development Potential:** The obtained results create new perspectives for further research or practical implementations in the relevant field.
- **Difference from Previous Works:** The research differs from previous works due to a new perspective on the problem, new methods, or interpretations of the results.

- Does not meet the criteria
- Requires revision
- Meets the criteria

### 8 Methodology of the Research.\*

- **Clarity:** The article clearly presents the research methods, allowing an understanding of the steps and approaches of the research.
- **Adequacy:** The applied methods correspond to the set objectives of the research and are relevant for achieving scientific results.
- **Adaptability:** The described research methods can be adapted for similar studies or applied in new contexts.
- **Detailing:** The description of the methodology is sufficiently detailed for understanding the process of obtaining results, conducting experiments, or analysis.

- Does not meet the criteria
- Needs improvement
- Meets the criteria

### 9 Replicability of the Research.\*

- **Completeness:** The research methodology is described in sufficient detail for other researchers to replicate the experiments or analysis under similar conditions.
- **Availability:** All necessary data is clearly presented, allowing for reuse by other researchers.
- **Transparency:** The processes of data collection and processing are transparently articulated to ensure replicability without further clarification.
- **Comprehensiveness:** The description includes all key details that allow other authors to apply the presented methods to similar or new cases.

- Does not meet the criteria
- Needs improvement
- Meets the criteria

### 10 Discussion and Results.\*

- **Clarity:** The discussion of the results is presented clearly, allowing for an understanding of their significance in the context of the research.
- **Connection to Goals and Objectives:** The research results are justified in the context of the main goals and objectives set at the beginning of the article.
- **Context:** The results are presented in comparison with other studies, confirming their relevance and significance for the scientific community.
- **Limitations:** The work outlines limitations that may affect the research results.

- Does not meet the criteria
- Needs improvement
- Meets the criteria

### 11 Conclusions.\*

- **Logic:** The conclusions summarize the research results and logically follow from the discussion, highlighting the key findings of the research.
- **Relevance:** The conclusions clearly correspond to the goals and objectives set at the beginning of the article, emphasizing the main achievements.

- **Practical Recommendations:** The conclusions include suggestions for practical application of the results and recommendations for further research based on the obtained results.

- Does not meet the criteria
- Needs improvement
- Meets the criteria

## **12 Language and Writing Style.\***

- **Clarity:** The text is written in clear and accessible language, facilitating the comprehension of information.
- **Scientific Style:** The terms and formulations used conform to the scientific style and accepted terminology in the field.
- **Spelling and Grammar:** The text contains no spelling or grammatical errors, indicating a high level of editorial quality.

- Does not meet the criteria
- Needs improvement
- Meets the criteria