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“Open Review Hub” - is an online platform that provides the Open Peer Review process, which involves abandoning anonymity and switching from a blank pre-peer review to an open, post-public review.

Article submission algorithm

1. **Prepare article materials**

   Submitted papers should be laid out in compliance with templates available from the conference website (Important Documents - Template)

2. **Registration on website https://openreviewhub.org**

   Choose the «Login» button in the upper right corner or go to the https://openreviewhub.org/user link. Registration can be done using social networks мережі (Google+ або Facebook) or by going to the «Create new account» tab and filling in the appropriate fields.
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   A mandatory registration requirement for a site is to submit ORCID ID. If you do not already have this ID, please register https://orcid.org/register (registration will take no more than 1 minute). Make your ORCID profile visible to all users.

   An example of completing the registration form is presented in the next page.
By registering on the site you agree to receive e-mail from the site.
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**LinkedIn**
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**Website**
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**Accept Terms & Conditions of Use**
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Create new account
By registering on the site, you can edit and add additional information about your activity. To do this, select the "Edit" tab on the profile page.

3. **Submit article**

Go to the conference site that interests you, and choose the "Add Submit an application" button on the main page.
Abstract *

The work proves the importance of responsive web design for university websites and describes such a design using the new website of Lviv Polytechnic National University case study. General approaches that were used aim to satisfy the demands of webmasters and content managers as well as website visitors. The paper presents the key tools of website construction with distributed approach to manage content. We considered usage patterns according to main specifics of modern devices to ensure the site to be configured properly and viewable.
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Upload manuscript *

1. test.docx

Include file in display

Description

Upload manuscript PDF *
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Save Preview
After saving the form, you will receive a letter confirming submission of the abstracts to your e-mail (check the spam folder) with the following contents:

4. Article checks

Secretary check your article to make sure you have submitted everything correctly. Many articles fail these checks the first time round so don't worry if this happens to you!

*The main reasons for the rejection of an article at this stage can be:*

- mismatch of the topic;
- non-compliance with the requirements for the execution of an article and a certain structure proposed by the magazine (a definite template);
- lack of key elements such as title, author information, keywords, list of used sources, etc.
- significant grammatical and stylistic mistakes in the text;
- incomprehensibility of the schemes and illustrations presented in the article;
- presence of plagiarism.

The secretary sends a comment about the reason for the refusal and deletes your application from the system.

You will receive an e-mail of the following content
5. Changes and re-submission of the application

Most authors re-submit their articles within 1-2 days.

6. Your application has been pre-validated and accepted for review

You will receive the following e-mail notification of the acceptance of the article for review

After confirmation, the article will be presented on the "All Submitted Papers" page of the conference site.
All users will be able to see, read, distribute Your article through social networks and comment.

An example of submitting an article on a site
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ABSTRACT

Let $\mathbf{r}(s)$ be the position vector of a curve $\Gamma$ moving on surface $M$ in $\mathbb{E}^3$ such that $\mathbf{r}(s)$ is a unit speed curve for all $s$. If the surface $M$ is a Hasimoto surface, then the position vector $\mathbf{r}$ satisfy the following condition

$$\mathbf{r} = \mathbf{r} \times \dot{\mathbf{r}}$$

also called as smoke ring equation or vortex filament [1]. In that work, we investigate the geometric properties according to Bishop frame of Hasimoto surfaces in Euclidean 3-space. Also, we give some characterization of parameter curves given according to Bishop frame of Hasimoto surfaces.
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7. Secretary recruits reviewers

Secretary identifies potential reviewers and personally invites them to review your submission. Most secretary recruit 2 reviewers, but sometimes more may be required.

Authors of theses also have an opportunity to be involved in the search of reviewers. To do this, select the "Finding reviewers" button on the article page.

It is possible to search for reviewers by subject and scientific areas.
By choosing the reviewers who are most relevant to the subject matter of the article, you may go over to his profile on the system and choose the "Invitation Letter to Review" button.

In the submitted form, in the "Paper Title" field, indicate the title of the article that will be reviewed and save the invitation.

The reviewer will receive an email asking for reviewing for this article.
The minimum number of making the decision is 2 positive reviews. An additional review decision may be made in the following cases:

- if the author of the article does not agree with the reviewer's conclusion, and sent the reasoned comment;
- if the decision of one of the reviews is negative.

All reviews are published on the page of the relevant article with the details of the reviewer.
All users can also comment on and distribute the submitted review in social networks.

An example of a review is presented on the next page
Making changes and submitting a new version of the article

If the reviewer gave a negative feedback and recommendations to make changes to the article, the author should submit a new (with changes) version of the article, which attaches to the relevant comment on the page of the article already submitted.

The article should be sent in two formats: DOC and PDF
The comment on the attached new version of the article:
Become a Reviewer

Those registered users at https://openreviewhub.org, that have a scientific degree and conduct active research, may also be reviewers and contribute the development of science.

In order to be able to review the articles, you must click on the "Apply to Become a Reviewer" button on your profile page or any submitted article and complete the registration form.

An example of completing the registration form is given below
Create Become a reviewer

Title *
Become a reviewer

Scopus Author ID

Your Google Scholar Profile *
https://scholar.google.com.ua/citations?user=rd6KiyhAAAAJ&hl=ru

Your ResearcherID Profile

ResearchGate

Linkedin
https://www.linkedin.com/in/ivvillja-kovilja-25954121/

Website
http://dp.edu.ua/prv/strelcy-vd38u

Your disciplines *
- Agriculture
- Architecture
- Arts
- Astronomy & Astrophysics
- Chemistry
- Classical studies
- Computer science
- Earth & Environmental sciences
- Economics
- Education
- Engineering
- Geosciences
- History
- Law
- Life sciences
- Linguistics & Semiotics
- Literary studies
- Materials science
- Mathematics
- Medicine
- Philosophy
- Physics
- Religious studies & Theology
- Social & Behavioral Sciences
- Statistics
- Veterinary medicine
- Other (please, specify)

Subject Area *
www, web design, open review

Short Biography

Other Information
You will receive an email confirming your role as a reviewer (this may take some time)

After that, You have been given the role of a reviewer – You can go to the site, select articles that are relevant to your scientific topics and add your own reviews.

An example form of a review is provided on the next page
Create Review

Article's title *
Content-aware decision support software service (1041)

Title *
Review of an article submitted to the conference

The article's title reflects the content and purpose of the article? *
- Yes
- Partially
- No

Was the aim of the work clearly defined and successfully accomplished? *
- Yes
- Partially
- No

Does the article embrace contemporary issues in the area? *
- Yes
- Partially
- No

Does the article contain new and not published results? *
- Yes
- I do not know
- No

Was the article clearly written and easily understood? *
- Easily understood
- Understood with effort
- Difficult
- Not clear

Conclusions illustrate the research results, recommendations and giving suggestions for future research *
- Yes
- Partially
- No

The references are full and grounded? *
- Yes
- Partially
- No

How adequate was the writing and used terminology? *
- Adequate
- Rather adequate
- Not adequate

Remarks and suggestions to the authors of the article *

The conclusion should be expanded.

Scientific Standard *
- I have read this submission. I believe that I have an appropriate level of expertise to confirm that it is of an acceptable scientific standard.
- I have read this submission. I believe that I have an appropriate level of expertise to confirm that it is of an acceptable scientific standard, however I have insignificant reservations, as outlined above.
- I have read this submission. I believe that I have an appropriate level of expertise to confirm that it is of an acceptable scientific standard, however I have significant reservations, as outlined above.
- I have read this submission. I believe that I have an appropriate level of expertise to state that I do not consider it to be of an acceptable scientific standard, for reasons outlined above.

Approval status *
- Accept without remarks
- Accept without acknowledging of remarks
- Accept after acknowledging of remarks
- Reject

I confirm that there is no conflict of interests regarding reviewed article. *