**Peer Review and Editorial Procedure**

Peer review is a crucial aspect of the publication process, ensuring that MDPI maintains the highest quality standards for its published papers. All manuscripts submitted to our journals undergo strict and thorough peer review by experts.

Upon submission, the journal’s Managing Editor conducts a technical pre-check of the manuscript. A suitable academic editor is then notified of the submission and invited to perform an editorial pre-check, including recommending reviewers. Academic editors can choose to continue with the peer review process, reject a manuscript, or request revisions before peer review. If the peer review process continues, the Editorial Office organizes the review, conducted by independent experts, and collects at least two review reports per manuscript. Authors are requested to make adequate revisions, including a second round of peer review, if necessary, before a final decision is reached. The ultimate decision is made by an academic editor, usually the Editor-in-Chief, an Editorial Board Member, or the Guest Editor of a Special Issue. Accepted manuscripts undergo internal copy-editing and English editing.

Reviewers' Profile and Responsibilities

The role of the reviewer is crucial and carries significant responsibility in upholding the integrity of the scholarly record. Each reviewer is expected to conduct manuscript evaluations in a timely, transparent, and ethical manner, adhering to the COPE guidelines available at <https://publicationethics.org/files/cope-ethical-guidelines-peer-reviewers-v2_0.pdf>.

Reviewers should fulfil the following criteria:

1. Have no conflicts of interest with any of the authors.
2. Not be affiliated with the same institution as the authors.
3. Not have collaborated with the authors in publications within the last three years.
4. Hold a PhD or MD (applicable for medical journals).
5. Possess relevant experience and demonstrate a proven publication record in the field of the submitted paper (Scopus, ORCID).
6. Be experienced scholars in the field of the submitted paper.
7. Maintain an official and recognized academic affiliation.

TMP is committed to a rigorous peer-review process to ensure a comprehensive evaluation of each manuscript—a fundamental responsibility for our reviewers. Reviewers who agree to assess a manuscript are expected to:

1. Possess the necessary expertise to evaluate the scientific quality of the manuscript.
2. Provide high-quality review reports and remain responsive throughout the peer-review process.
3. Uphold standards of professionalism and ethics.

**General Guidelines for Reviewers**

Manuscripts submitted to TMP journals undergo evaluation by a minimum of two experts, comprising volunteer reviewers, members of the Reviewer Board, or individuals recommended by the academic editor during the preliminary check. Reviewers are tasked with assessing the manuscript's quality and delivering a recommendation to the external editor, indicating whether the manuscript should be accepted, undergo revisions, or be rejected.

**Invited reviewers are kindly requested to:**

Accept or decline invitations promptly, based on the manuscript's title and abstract.

Propose alternative reviewers if an invitation must be declined.

Request a deadline extension at the earliest convenience if additional time is needed to provide a comprehensive report.