

Peer review process

Upon receiving the submitted manuscript and confirming that all formal requirements for continuing the publication procedure have been met, the Editorial Board of the *Techno Science* journal initiates the peer review process to assess the relevance, clarity, validity, and sound methodology of the submitted manuscript.

Book, journal, project, and scientific conference reviews, as well as related evaluations and assessments, are not subject to the peer review process.

The manuscript review is conducted according to the "double-blind" principle – an anonymised manuscript is sent to two reviewers (established experts listed in our reviewer database, relevant to the subject area of the submitted manuscript), with the identities of the two reviewers and the author remaining mutually anonymous throughout the evaluation process. To avoid conflicts of interest, reviewers must not be affiliated with the same institution as the author, nor can they share close familial or professional ties with them.

The reviewer may not use the unpublished data presented in the manuscript for their own research without the author's written consent. Information exchanged during the peer review process must remain confidential.

Based on the reviewers' evaluation (submitted to the Editorial Board in written form), the manuscript may be accepted, returned to the author for revision, or rejected. If a manuscript undergoes revision, the peer review process is repeated.

Upon the reviewers' recommendation, the accepted manuscript is categorised as one of the following:

- Original Scientific Paper (a paper containing new, previously unpublished results of scientific research, representing an original contribution)
- Preliminary Communication (a scientific paper containing new research results obtained for a scientific problem that requires rapid publication; an original scientific paper of a smaller scale/preliminary character)
- Review Paper (a critical overview of a research area without a significant degree of originality, offering a new synthesis of scientific information – a work characterised more by synthetic rather than analytical features)
- Professional Paper (it does not represent original research and lacks distinct scientific characteristics – it may offer proposals/methods for applying the previously published scientific research results or provide an overview of a specific scientific topic)

In cases where the reviewers disagree regarding the manuscript's evaluation or its categorisation as an Original Scientific Paper, the Editorial Board undertakes the responsibility of seeking a third

reviewer's opinion, adhering to the same principle as the previous two reviews. The final decision regarding the manuscript's status (its acceptance, rejection, necessity for revision, and categorisation) is made by the Editorial Board, guided by the reviewers' reports and evaluations. Reviewers are not expected to proofread or copy-edit the paper, but they may indicate the need for additional language editing if they deem it necessary. *Techno Science* publishes only categorised papers that have received at least two positive reviews. The Editorial Board notifies the author of the manuscript in writing regarding the peer review results and the final decision.