

## PUBLICATION POLICY

### Reviewing procedure

#### Peer Review Statement

Manuscripts are sent for review only if they pass an initial evaluation based on their format and thematic scope. This evaluation is conducted promptly to avoid unnecessary delays.

Under normal circumstances, the review process typically takes up to four weeks, but in exceptional cases, it may extend to two months. The entire duration from manuscript submission to publication averages around 90 days.

#### The reviewing procedure is as follows:

- The author submits the manuscript.
- The Editor assigns reviewers to assess the manuscript.
- Reviewers evaluate the manuscript based on its originality, theoretical and methodological soundness, coherence of analysis, and its ability to effectively communicate to readers.
- The Editor prepares a decision based on the reviewers' feedback and sends it to the author.

Please note that the review process for submitted papers in this collection follows a double-blind peer review system.

#### Peer Review:

All submitted papers undergo a peer-review process, specifically a double-blind peer review. This means that reviewers are unaware of the authors' identities, and vice versa. At least two reviewers are assigned to each manuscript, and the typical review period is four weeks, although this timeframe may be adjusted during the editorial process.

The selection of reviewers is at the discretion of the editors, ensuring their expertise in the subject area while avoiding any affiliation with the authors' institution or recent collaborations. Reviewers are required to disclose any conflicts of interest related to the research, authors, or funding sources. If reviewers feel unqualified or unable to conduct a timely review, they should promptly notify the Editor.

Reviews must be conducted objectively, avoiding personal criticism of the author. Reviewers should express their views clearly and provide supporting arguments.

Confidentiality is crucial, and all manuscripts received for review should be treated as confidential documents.

Authors submit their manuscripts to the Editorial Office through the online system, receiving an acknowledgment of receipt. The Chief Editor conducts an initial review, assisted by Section Editors or Associate Editors. The manuscript is checked for adherence to the Collection's scope, formal requirements, and style. If deemed unsuitable, the author is promptly informed, resulting in direct rejection. Suitable manuscripts meeting the Collection's criteria are sent for review. Depending on the type of paper, some manuscripts may be accepted for publication immediately by the Chief Editor.

Before sending the manuscript for review, the Editor ensures that it conforms to the Journal's style, contains an abstract (if applicable), keywords, correct referencing, and adheres to the appropriate blinding system. If any elements are missing, the author is asked to complete them before the manuscript is sent for review.

Once sent for review, the manuscript is evaluated by the assigned reviewers, who subsequently provide review reports to the Chief Editor. The review period typically ranges from 2 to 6 weeks, depending on the discipline. Clear instructions are provided to reviewers, either in the form of a review report or a set of questions to consider.

Based on the reviewers' comments, the Chief Editor makes a decision, which can include accepting the manuscript without further revision, accepting it after minor revisions, requesting resubmission with significant changes, or rejecting it. The author receives an acceptance or rejection letter accordingly. If revisions are requested, the author is expected to address the reviewers' comments and submit an updated version.

After the review process, the manuscript is passed on to the Copy Editor, responsible for correcting referencing according to the journal's style and layout. Once the Copy Editor completes their work, the manuscript proceeds to the Layout Editor, who structures the original manuscript, including figures and tables, into an article and prepares it in various formats, such as PDF and HTML. The Layout Editor then forwards the manuscript to the Proof Editor.

The Proof Editor confirms that the manuscript has undergone all the necessary stages and is ready for publication.

Reviewers for each paper work independently, unaware of each other's identities. If there is a discrepancy in the decisions of the two reviewers (accept/reject), additional reviewers may be assigned by the Editor.

The Editorial team ensures reasonable quality control for reviews. If authors raise credible concerns about a reviewer's feedback, steps are taken to ensure objectivity and maintain high academic standards. Additional reviewers may be assigned when doubt arises regarding the reviews' objectivity or quality.

## **Basic Principles for Reviewers:**

### **Reviewers should:**

Only agree to review manuscripts within their expertise and assess them in a timely manner. Maintain confidentiality and refrain from disclosing details of the manuscript or its review beyond what is released by the collection.

Avoid using information obtained during the review process for personal advantage or to disadvantage others.

Disclose any potential conflicting interests and seek guidance from the collection if unsure. Avoid being influenced by the authors' characteristics or commercial considerations, remaining objective and constructive in their reviews.

Recognize that peer review is a reciprocal endeavor and fulfill their fair share of reviewing promptly.

Provide accurate and true personal and professional information to the collection.

Understand that impersonating others during the review process is considered serious misconduct.

## **Resolving inconsistencies**

If the authors have legitimate and valid concerns regarding the reviews they received, the Editorial Board will evaluate the objectivity and academic standards of the reviews. If there is uncertainty about the impartiality or quality of a review, the Editor-in-Chief will assign additional reviewer(s).

Extra reviewers can also be appointed when the decisions of the reviewers (whether to accept or reject) conflict with each other or are significantly incompatible.

Ultimately, the Editor-in-Chief has the exclusive authority to make the final decision on whether to accept the manuscript for publication.

## **Responsibilities**

### **Authors' responsibilities**

Authors affirm that their manuscripts are original papers, not previously published, and not under consideration for publication elsewhere. Submitting the same paper to another collection of papers simultaneously is considered misconduct and will result in the manuscript being disqualified from further consideration. The COLLECTION OF PAPERS NEW ECONOMY does not accept manuscripts that have already been published elsewhere.

Authors bear full responsibility for the content of their submissions. They assert that the article does not contain any unfounded or unlawful statements and does not infringe upon the rights of third parties.

Authors must ensure that the list of authors included in the manuscript includes only those who have made significant contributions to the submitted work. If individuals other than the authors have played important roles in the research project and the preparation of the manuscript, their contributions should be acknowledged in a footnote or in the Acknowledgments section.

Authors are required to provide the title and code label of the research project under which the work was conducted, as well as the full name of the funding institution. If the manuscript has been presented orally at a conference with the same or similar title, detailed information about the conference should be provided in the appropriate section.

Authors are obliged to appropriately cite sources that have greatly influenced their research and manuscript. Text, equations, pictures, and tables that are directly taken from other works must be clearly indicated, for example, by using quotation marks and providing the location in the original document (page number), or by presenting them in a separate paragraph if the excerpt is extensive.

Comprehensive references for each quotation (in-text citation) must be listed in a separate section (Literature or References) in a consistent manner, following the citation style used by the . The References section should only include sources that have been quoted or cited, not all the sources used during the manuscript preparation.

If authors discover a significant error or inaccuracy in their published work, they are obliged to promptly inform the Editor-in-Chief (or publisher) and collaborate to either retract or correct the paper.

Authors should disclose any financial or other substantial conflicts of interest that may have influenced the presented results or their interpretation in their manuscript.

By submitting a manuscript, authors agree to comply with the Editorial Policies of the COLLECTION OF PAPERS NEW ECONOMY.

## **Funding statement**

Authors submitting to the COLLECTION OF PAPERS NEW ECONOMY are required to disclose any sources of funding for the research presented in their paper. This includes institutional, private, and corporate financial support. The relevant information, such as the names of the funding organizations and grant numbers, should be provided under the heading 'Funding' at the end of the article when submitting the paper. If no funding was received, authors should state the following: "This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors." Additionally, any suppliers of materials should be identified, and their location (town, state/county, country) should be included if applicable. This information will be included in the published article.

## **Editorial Policy**

EDITORIAL POLICY of the Collection of Papers New Economy is carried out by the editorial board, international editorial board, editor-in-chief and editor-in-chief, assistant editor-in-chief, technical editor and graphic design editor. The call for submission of papers was published on the New Economy website <https://conference.oikosinstitut.org/>

All papers are sent to the address:

[novi.economics.institut@gmail.com](mailto:novi.economics.institut@gmail.com)

The editorial office analyzes and sorts the papers according to research areas and submits them to the technical editor who checks their technical formatting, links and uses dedicated software to check whether the paper was original or possibly plagiarized. After that, the papers are submitted under a code for peer review by competent university professors specialized in the given scientific discipline. The principle of double-blind peer review is strictly observed, in which the professor who reviews the paper does not know who the author of the paper is, nor does the author have any information about the person who reviews his paper. After the works have been positively evaluated, they are submitted for proofreading. When the proofreader performs his duty, all papers are sent to the authors for the necessary corrections, changes and finishing. After the translation is completed, all peer-reviewed papers are submitted to the technical editor for formatting and integration into the journal. The final stage is marked by the submission of all papers, including anonymous reviews, to the editor-in-chief, who, together with the editors, proposes the publication and categorization of papers (Original Scientific Paper, Previous Communication, Conference Paper, Review Paper, Professional Paper).

After the signature of the editor-in-chief and editor-in-chief, the works are forwarded to the printing house with which Nova ekonomija has signed a contract to print 200 copies of each issue of the Collection. The last step is to deliver the magazine to the relevant libraries, all authors, universities, faculties and everyone who is interested in Collection of this type. Authors are expected to pay 100 EUR after their article has been approved by the reviewers, before publication of the Collection.

## **Editorial Responsibilities**

The Editor-in-Chief is responsible for determining which articles will be published in the Collection of Papers. These decisions are based solely on quality and merit manuscript. The Editor-in-Chief is committed to ensuring that the decision-making process is impartial and without any form of discrimination, including factors such as race, gender, sexual orientation, religion, ethnicity or political views. In addition, editor-in-chief follows the editorial policy and respects legal regulations regarding defamation, copyright infringement and plagiarism when making a decision.

All members of the Editorial Board, including the editor-in-chief and editor-in-chief, are required to have no conflicts of interest related to the articles they are evaluating for publication. If the member feels that there could be a perception of a conflict of interest, they will not participate in its decision making process for that particular manuscript.

Information and ideas presented in submitted manuscripts are treated as confidential.

Any information or ideas found in unpublished materials may not be used for personal gain without written consent of the author. The editors and editorial staff make every effort to ensure the anonymity of the authors and reviewers are maintained during and after the evaluation process, in accordance with the specific type of review used.

## **Reviewers' responsibilities**

Reviewers are obligated to provide a qualified and timely assessment of the scholarly merits of the manuscript. The reviewer pays particular attention to the genuine contribution and originality of the manuscript. The review process must be completely objective, and the judgments made by the reviewers should be clear and supported by arguments.

During the review process, reviewers evaluate the manuscript based on its alignment with the journal's scope, the relevance of the investigated topic and employed methods, the scientific significance of the information presented, and the quality of the presentation and scholarly references. The review follows a standardized format.

Reviewers are required to declare any potential conflicts of interest with the authors or funders of the research. If such conflicts exist, the reviewer must promptly inform the Editor-in-Chief. Reviewers should not accept papers for review that fall outside their area of expertise.

If reviewers have well-founded suspicions or knowledge of possible ethical violations by the authors, they should bring this to the attention of the Editor-in-Chief.

Reviewers should identify relevant published works that have not been considered in the manuscript. They may suggest specific references for citation, but they should not demand the inclusion of papers published in the same collection papers or their own papers, unless it is justified.

Reviewers are expected to enhance the quality of the manuscript through their suggestions. If they recommend corrections before publication, they should specify how these improvements can be achieved.

Confidentiality must be maintained for all manuscripts received for review. Reviewers must not use unpublished materials disclosed in the submitted manuscripts without the express written consent of the authors.

## **Ethical publishing**

### **Publication Ethics and Publication Malpractice Statement**

For all parties involved in the act of publishing (the author, the collection papers editor(s), the peer reviewer and the publisher) it is necessary to agree upon standards of expected ethical behavior. The ethics statements for COLLECTION OF PAPERS are based on the [Committee on Publication Ethics \(COPE\)](#) Best Practice Guidelines for Collection of Papers Editors.

### **Editor Responsibilities**

#### **Accountability**

The editor of a peer-reviewed Collection of Papers is responsible for deciding which articles submitted to the Collection of Papers should be published, and, moreover, is accountable for everything published in the Collection of Papers. In making these decisions, the editor may be guided by the policies of the collection of papers editorial board as well as by legal requirements regarding libel, copyright infringement and plagiarism. The editor may confer with other editors or reviewers when making publication decisions. The editor should maintain the integrity of the academic record, preclude business needs from compromising intellectual and ethical standards, and always be willing to publish corrections, clarifications, retractions and apologies when needed.

#### **Fairness**

The editor should evaluate manuscripts for intellectual content without regard to race, gender, sexual orientation, religious belief, ethnic origin, citizenship, or political philosophy of the author(s). The editor will not disclose any information about a manuscript under consideration to anyone other than the author(s), reviewers and potential reviewers, and in some instances the editorial board members, as appropriate.

#### **Confidentiality**

The editor and any editorial staff must not disclose any information about a submitted manuscript to anyone other than the corresponding author, reviewers, potential reviewers, other editorial advisers, and the publisher, as appropriate. Disclosure, conflicts of interest, and other issues The editor will be guided by COPE's Guidelines for Retracting Articles when considering retracting, issuing expressions of concern about, and issuing corrections pertaining to articles that have been published in Economics. Unpublished materials disclosed in a submitted manuscript must not be used in an editor's own research without the express written consent of the author. Privileged information or ideas obtained through peer review must be kept confidential and not used for personal advantage. The editor is committed to ensuring that advertising, reprint or other commercial revenue has no impact or influence on editorial decisions. The editor should seek to ensure a fair and appropriate peer review process. Editors should recuse themselves (i.e. should ask a co-editor, associate editor or other member of the editorial board instead to review and consider) from considering manuscripts in which they

have conflicts of interest resulting from competitive, collaborative, or other relationships or connections with any of the authors, companies, or (possibly) institutions connected to the papers. Editors should require all contributors to disclose relevant competing interests and publish corrections if competing interests are revealed after publication. If needed, other appropriate action should be taken, such as the publication of a retraction or expression of concern.

**Involvement and cooperation in investigations:** Editors should guard the integrity of the published record by issuing corrections and retractions when needed and pursuing suspected or alleged research and publication misconduct. Editors should pursue reviewer and editorial misconduct. An editor should take reasonably responsive measures when ethical complaints have been presented concerning a submitted manuscript or published paper.

### **Reviewer Responsibilities**

**Contribution to editorial decisions:** Peer review assists the editor in making editorial decisions and, through the editorial communication with the author, may also assist the author in improving the manuscript.

#### **Promptness**

Any invited referee who feels unqualified to review the research reported in a manuscript or knows that its timely review will be impossible should immediately notify the editor so that alternative reviewers can be contacted.

#### **Confidentiality**

Any manuscripts received for review must be treated as confidential documents. They must not be shown to or discussed with others except if authorized by the editor.

**Standards of objectivity:** Reviews should be conducted objectively. Personal criticism of the author is unacceptable. Referees should express their views clearly with appropriate supporting arguments.

**Acknowledgement of sources:** Reviewers should identify relevant published paper that has not been cited by the authors. Any statement that an observation, derivation, or argument had been previously reported should be accompanied by the relevant citation. A reviewer should also call to the editor's attention any substantial similarity or overlap between the manuscript under consideration and any other published data of which they have personal knowledge.

**Disclosure and conflict of interest:** Privileged information or ideas obtained through peer review must be kept confidential and not used for personal advantage. Reviewers should not consider evaluating manuscripts in which they have conflicts of interest resulting from competitive, collaborative, or other relationships or connections with any of the authors, companies, or institutions connected to the submission.



## **Author Responsibilities**

**Reporting standards:** Authors reporting results of original research should present an accurate account of the paper performed as well as an objective discussion of its significance. Underlying data should be represented accurately in the manuscript. A paper should contain sufficient detail and references to permit others to replicate the paper. Fraudulent or knowingly inaccurate statements constitute unethical behavior and are unacceptable.

**Originality and Plagiarism:** The authors should ensure that they have written entirely original papers, and if the authors have used the paper and/or words of others that this has been appropriately cited or quoted.

**Multiple, redundant or concurrent publication:** An author should not in general publish manuscripts describing essentially the same research in more than one journal or primary publication. Parallel submission of the same manuscript to more than one journal constitutes unethical publishing behavior and is unacceptable.

**Acknowledgement of sources:** Proper acknowledgment of the paper of others must always be given. Authors should also cite publications that have been influential in determining the nature of the reported paper.

**Authorship of a manuscript:** Authorship should be limited to those who have made a significant contribution to the conception, design, execution, or interpretation of the reported study. All those who have made significant contributions should be listed as co-authors. Where there are others who have participated in certain substantive aspects of the research project, they should be named in an Acknowledgement section. The corresponding author should ensure that all appropriate co-authors (according to the above definition) and no inappropriate co-authors are included in the author list of the manuscript, and that all co-authors have seen and approved the final version of the paper and have agreed to its submission for publication.

**Hazards and human or animal subjects:** If the paper involves chemicals, procedures or equipment that have any unusual hazards inherent in their use, the authors must clearly identify these in the manuscript.

**Disclosure and conflicts of interest:** All authors should disclose in their manuscript any financial or other substantive conflict of interest that might be construed to influence the results or their interpretation in the manuscript. All sources of financial support for the project should be disclosed.

**Fundamental errors in published papers:** When an author discovers a significant error or inaccuracy in his/her own published paper, it is the author's obligation to promptly notify the journal's editor or publisher and cooperate with them to either retract the paper or to publish an appropriate erratum.

**Publisher's Confirmation:** In cases of alleged or proven scientific misconduct, fraudulent publication or plagiarism the publisher, in close collaboration with the editors, will take all appropriate measures to clarify the situation and to amend the article in question. This includes the prompt publication of an erratum or, in the most severe cases, the complete retraction of the affected paper.

## **Post-publication discussions and corrections**

This Collection of Papers encourages post-publication discourse through letters to the editor or participation on an external moderated platform, like PubPeer. [PubPeer](#) is an online platform where users can engage in discussions and provide feedback on scientific research that has already been published. Our Collection of Papers adheres to the guidelines set by COPE (Committee on Publication Ethics) regarding [post-publication discussions and corrections](#).

## **Dealing with unethical behaviour**

Any individual can report suspected unethical behavior or misconduct to the Editor-in-Chief or Editorial Board by providing credible information or evidence to initiate an investigation.

The decision to initiate an investigation lies with the Editor-in-Chief. During the investigation, all evidence should be treated as confidential and only accessible to those directly involved in the process. The accused will always be given an opportunity to respond to any charges brought against them. If, at the conclusion of the investigation, misconduct is determined, it will be categorized as either minor or serious. Minor misconduct, which does not significantly impact the integrity of the paper or the Proceedings (e.g., misunderstandings or incorrect application of publishing standards), will be addressed directly with the authors and reviewers.

Possible outcomes may include:

- Sending a warning letter to the authors and/or reviewers.
- Publishing a correction for the paper, such as adding properly quoted sources that were initially omitted from the reference list.
- Publishing an erratum if the error was made by the editorial staff.

In the case of major misconduct, the Editor-in-Chief or Editorial Board may take different measures, such as:

- Publishing a formal announcement or editorial describing the misconduct.
- Officially informing the author's or reviewer's affiliated institution.
- Formally retracting publications from the journal in accordance with the Retraction Policy.
- Imposing a submission ban on an individual for a defined period.
- Referring the case to a professional organization or legal authority for further investigation and action.

- The aforementioned actions can be taken separately or in combination. If necessary, relevant expert organizations, bodies, or individuals may be consulted during the resolution of the case.

When addressing unethical behavior, the Editorial Board will rely on the guidelines and recommendations provided by the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE).

## **Plagiarism prevention**

The COLLECTION OF PAPERS NEW ECONOMY has a strict policy against publishing plagiarized papers. The Editorial Board firmly believes that plagiarism, which involves presenting someone else's ideas, words, or creative expression as one's own, is a clear violation of scientific ethics. Plagiarism can also infringe upon copyright laws and may result in legal consequences.

All papers submitted to the COLLECTION OF PAPERS NEW ECONOMY undergo scrutiny using [iThenticate](#) software, which helps detect instances of plagiarism.

Plagiarism encompasses the following actions:

- Directly copying or closely paraphrasing portions of another author's work without properly acknowledging the source or appropriately indicating the copied content (e.g., using quotation marks) in accordance with the responsibilities outlined for authors.
- Replicating equations, figures, or tables from someone else's paper without citing the source and obtaining necessary permission from the original author or copyright holder.

Any manuscript that exhibits clear indications of plagiarism will be automatically rejected. In the event that plagiarism is identified in a paper that has already been published by the Collection of papers the paper will be retracted in accordance with the procedures outlined in the Retraction Policy.

## **Retraction policy**

Retracting an article is necessary in cases where there are legal constraints imposed by the publisher, copyright holder, or author(s), as well as violations of professional ethical codes such as multiple submissions, false authorship claims, plagiarism, fraudulent data use, or any significant misconduct.

In certain instances, a retraction may be utilized to rectify multiple serious errors that cannot be adequately addressed through publishing corrections. The decision to retract an article can be made collaboratively by the Editor-in-Chief, Editorial Board, and the author(s).

The retraction is presented as a distinct item in the journal's contents, clearly labeled as "Retraction." The original article remains unchanged, except for the addition of a watermark on each page of the PDF indicating that it has been "retracted."

## **Open access**

### **Open Access Policy**

*COLECTION OF PAPERS NEW ECONOMY* is published under an Open Access license. All its content is available free of charge. Users can read, download, copy, distribute, print, search the full text of articles, as well as to establish HTML links to them, without having to seek the consent of the author or publisher.

The right to use content without consent does not release the users from the obligation to give the credit to the journal and its content in a manner described under Licensing.

### **Archiving digital version**

COLLECTION OF PAPERS NEW ECONOMY strives for the constant availability of published articles and online accessibility.

The Proceedings are archives the contents of this journal in [Portico](#) - digital long-term preservation service of scholarly books, journals and Proceedings.

### **Article processing charge**

Publishing fee is 100 EUR. The authors are expected to make the payment once their article is approved by the reviewers, prior to publishing the *COLECTION OF PAPERS*.

## **Copyright & Licensing**

### **Licensing**

Articles published in the Collection of Papers are Open-Access articles distributed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial - NoDerivs 4.0](#).

It is allowed to copy and redistribute the material in any medium or format, and remix, transform, and build upon it for any purpose, even commercially, as long as appropriate credit is given to the original author(s), a link to the license is provided, it is indicated if changes were made and the new work is distributed under the same license as the original.

Users are required to provide full bibliographic description of the original publication (authors, article title, journal title, volume, issue, pages), as well as its DOI code. In electronic publishing,

users are also required to link the content with both the original article published in COLLECTION OF PAPERS NEW ECONOMY.

Authors are able to enter into separate, additional contractual arrangements for the non-exclusive distribution of the collection's published version of the paper (e.g., post it to an institutional repository or publish it in a book), with an acknowledgement of its initial publication in this Collection of Papers.

## Copyright

The Author(s) warrant that their manuscript is their original paper that has not been published before; that it is not under consideration for publication elsewhere; and that its publication has been approved by all co-authors, if any, as well as tacitly or explicitly by the responsible authorities at the institution where the work was carried out. The Author(s) affirm that the article contains no unfounded or unlawful statements and does not violate the rights of others. If copyrighted papers are included, the Author(s) bear a responsibility to obtain written permission from the copyright owners. The Corresponding author, as the signing author, warrants that he/she has full power to make this grant on behalf of the Author(s).

By signing this agreement, the Corresponding author grants to the Publisher the following rights to the Manuscript, including any supplemental material, and any parts, extracts or elements thereof:

- the right to reproduce and distribute the Manuscript in printed form, including print-on-demand;
- the right to produce prepublications, reprints, and special editions of the Manuscript;
- the right to translate the Manuscript into other languages;
- the right to reproduce the Manuscript using photomechanical or similar means including, but not limited to photocopy, and the right to distribute these reproductions;
- the right to reproduce and distribute the Manuscript electronically or optically on any and all data carriers or storage media – especially in machine-readable/digitalized form on data carriers such as hard drive, CD-Rom, DVD, Blu-ray Disc (BD), Mini-Disk, data tape – and the right to reproduce and distribute the Article via these data carriers;
- the right to store the Manuscript in databases, including online databases, and the right of transmission of the Manuscript in all technical systems and modes;
- the right to make the Manuscript available to the public or to closed user groups on individual demand, for use on monitors or other readers (including e-books), and in printable form for the user, either via the internet, other online services, or via internal or external networks.

Articles published in the Collection of Papers are Open-Access articles distributed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial - NoDerivs 4.0](#).

The Papers allows Author(s) to deposit Author's Post-print (accepted version) and Publisher's version/PDF in an institutional repository and non-commercial subject-based repositories, such as PubMed Central, Europe PMC, arXiv and other repositories, or to publish it on Author's

personal website and departmental website (including social networking sites, such as ResearchGate, Academia.edu, etc.), at any time after publication. Publisher copyright and source must be acknowledged and a link must be made to the article's DOI.

Upon receiving the proofs, the Author(s) agree to promptly check the proofs carefully, correct any typographical errors, and authorize the publication of the corrected proofs.

The Corresponding author agrees to inform his/her co-authors, of any of the above terms.

### **Self-archiving Policy**

The COLECTION OF PAPERS permits authors to archive their papers in institutional repositories and non-commercial subject-based repositories, such as PubMed Central, Europe PMC, arXiv, and similar platforms. Authors are also allowed to publish their papers on their personal websites, departmental websites, and social networking sites like ResearchGate and Academia.edu. When depositing the paper, authors must include complete bibliographic information, including the authors' names, article title, journal title, volume, issue, and pages. Additionally, they should provide links to the article's DOI (Digital Object Identifier) and the associated license.

### **Disclaimer**

The opinions presented in the published papers do not reflect the opinions of the Editors and the Editorial Staff. The authors bear legal and ethical responsibility for the ideas expressed in their papers. The Publisher is not liable for any claims for damages that may arise, and they cannot be held legally responsible for any claims for compensation.