

## PEER REVIEW POLICY AND PROCEDURE

To uphold the principles of academic integrity and ethical standards adopted by the international scientific community, and to prevent any violations of these norms within its operations and interactions with all participants in the scholarly publishing process, all manuscripts submitted to *Ukrainian Linguistic Medieval Studies* undergo a mandatory **double-blind peer review** procedure. This format guarantees an independent professional evaluation where reviewers do not know the names of the authors, and authors do not know the names of the reviewers, thereby minimizing subjectivity and bias.

The primary **aim of peer review** is to ensure the high scientific quality of the publication through rigorous selection of materials and by providing authors with constructive recommendations for improvement.

The review procedure is designed for:

- An objective assessment of the scientific content, novelty, and relevance of the research;
- A comprehensive analysis of the structure, methodology, and writing style;
- Verification of the manuscript's compliance with the requirements for articles in *Ukrainian Linguistic Medieval Studies*.

At least **two independent experts**, who are recognized specialists in the relevant field of knowledge, are involved in the evaluation of each manuscript.

The peer review process for a scientific article typically takes **10–15 days**.

Reviewing is conducted on a **no-fee basis**.

### KEY PRINCIPLES OF THE PEER REVIEW POLICY

**Adherence to International Ethical Standards.** Reviewers conduct critical analysis of manuscripts in strict compliance with the COPE Ethical Guidelines for Peer Reviewers. Ethical obligations of reviewers include avoiding bias, respecting intellectual property rights, and recognizing the contributions of others. Reviewers must uphold the highest ethical standards in their evaluations.

**Impartiality and Objectivity.** Manuscripts are evaluated solely on their scientific merit. Factors such as race, gender, religious beliefs, citizenship, or political views of the authors do not influence decision-making. Communication is based on the principles of professional ethics and mutual respect.

**Confidentiality.** Submitted manuscripts are the intellectual property of the authors. Reviewers and editorial board members are prohibited from disclosing the content of articles or using the materials for personal gain prior to their official publication.

**Independent Expertise.** The journal utilizes a double-blind peer review method. In the event of a conflict of interest, the reviewer is required to decline the evaluation, after which the Editor-in-Chief will appoint another expert.

**Competent Expertise.** Reviewers include editorial board members or external independent specialists who hold an academic degree, have recent publications relevant to the article's topic, and have provided voluntary consent to conduct the evaluation.

**Editorial dialogue and the right to revision:**

- **Feedback:** Authors receive peer review results via email. Reviewers provide constructive criticism and recommendations for improving the text.

- **Appeals:** In the event of a reasoned disagreement with the reviewer's comments, the author has the right to provide an argumentative response. Such manuscripts are reviewed by a working group of the Editorial Board or forwarded to another specialist for additional "blind" peer review.
- **Decision:** The Editorial Board reserves the right to reject an article if the author is unable or unwilling to address the reviewers' critical comments. Once all deficiencies are fully rectified, the author may resubmit the manuscript.

**Academic integrity.** Any suspicion of unethical behavior (plagiarism, falsification, data fabrication) identified during the peer review process is handled by the Editor-in-Chief with strict confidentiality. If significant violations are confirmed, the Editorial Board will reject or retract the article and officially inform the author's employer of the identified breach of scientific ethics.

## **REVIEWER RESPONSIBILITIES**

Reviewers are required to:

- **Guarantee quality of evaluation:** provide timely, competent, and impartial written feedback regarding the scientific merit of the manuscript.
- **Conduct comprehensive analysis:** assess the relevance of the topic, originality of the research, significance of the results, validity of the methods, and writing style.
- **Ensure academic integrity:** immediately inform the editorial board of any suspicions regarding plagiarism, duplicate publication, or other breaches of research ethics.
- **Promote research completeness:** point out important published works related to the topic that have not been cited in the manuscript.
- **Maintain a culture of critique:** express their opinions clearly and with supporting arguments, avoiding personal attacks or offensive comments directed at the authors.
- **Provide constructive suggestions:** offer specific corrections to improve the logic, structure, and scientific quality of the article.

## **PEER REVIEW PROCEDURE**

All scientific articles submitted to the editorial board of *Ukrainian Linguistic Medieval Studies* undergo a **double-blind peer review** process. The manuscript review procedure includes the following stages:

### **1. Initial Editorial Review**

The editorial board verifies whether the submitted manuscript aligns with the journal's thematic profile, scientific criteria, and technical formatting requirements. At this stage, a mandatory academic integrity check (plagiarism detection) is also performed.

### **2. Expert Evaluation (Double-blind review)**

The Editor-in-Chief appoints two independent reviewers (holding Sc.D. degrees or Professorships) specialized in the research area for each article. The procedure guarantees full mutual anonymity between the author and the expert. The reviewer confirms the absence of any conflict of interest and provides a conclusion using a standardized form within 14 days.

### **3. Interaction with the Author and Appeals**

The editorial board sends the reviewers' comments to the author via email. The author must either incorporate the recommendations or provide a reasoned rebuttal. In case of disagreement with a reviewer, the author may submit an appeal, which is then reviewed by a working group of the Editorial Board. The board reserves the right to appoint an additional expert or reject the manuscript if comments are ignored.

### **4. Editorial Decision**

Based on the peer review results, the editorial board makes one of the following decisions:

- Accept the article for publication;
- Accept with revisions;
- Reconsider after significant revisions;
- Reject the article.

The final decision regarding publication is made by the Editor-in-Chief or the Editorial Board, after which the issue's contents are approved by the **Academic Council**.

### **5. Editing**

The literary editor makes stylistic and formal corrections that do not alter the study's content. If necessary, the editorial board coordinates the final layout of the article with the author.