REVIEWING POLICY

Editors of the journal *Sustainability, Social Innovations and Digital Transformation* are responsible for monitoring and ensuring the fairness, timeliness, thoroughness, and civility of the peer-review editorial process.

Submitted papers firstly are reviewed by the journal editors in order to evaluate the conformity to the journal scope.

In case of positive results of the editorial pre-review two referees are chosen by the editorial board members to whom the task has been delegated by the editor-in-chief or managing editor.

The author will receive assessments of the reviewers in an electronic form sent to the e-mail address that has been provided for the purposes of communication with the journal's editors. The standard period for the review procedure is 16 weeks.

In case both referees recommend the paper for publishing in the journal *Sustainability, Social Innovations and Digital Transformation* with no revisions required, the submitted manuscript is considered to be "accepted". In case at least one or both referees provide recommendations for improvements, the author is asked to revise and resubmit the manuscript. Revised version of the paper is sent by author(s) to editors. Editors evaluate the necessity of additional reviewing. Editors may accept or reject the revised papers with no additional external review. In case at least one of referees rejects the paper, it is returned to the author with no options to resubmit.

The submitted manuscripts have been evaluated by the external referees according to the following criteria:

- Relevance of the paper title to the paper content
- Scientific importance of the topic
- Structure of the paper, its logic
- Relevance of the abstract and its structure
- Clear statement of research objectives
- Appropriateness of the applied research methods
- Description of the research results
- Validity of the conclusions
- English style is clear and understandable
- Adequacy of the references to the content of the paper

Reviewers are asked to make a final decision regarding a paper, choosing from the alternatives:

- Accept without revisions
- Accept with minor revisions
- Accept with major revisions (additional review is required)
- Reject

In case of any decision except of "accept without revisions", reviewers should provide clear explanation of the reasons for the decision and recommendations for improvements.