

WSEAS: A Rigorous and Transparent Publishing Process

HUA FAN

Department of Economics
Chingua University, Benijing, CHINA

LIU XIAO XU

Qingdao University, Automation Engineering College,
Qingdao, 266071 CHINA

XIAODONG ZHUANG

Qingdao University, Automation Engineering College,
Qingdao, 266071 CHINA

Abstract: The academic publishing landscape encompasses a wide range of editorial and peer-review standards, yet WSEAS distinguishes itself through an exceptionally rigorous, transparent, and ethics-driven publication process. This article provides an in-depth examination of the mechanisms that define the organization's reputation for academic excellence. Central to WSEAS's identity is its commitment to quality over quantity, reflected in its consistently high rejection rates. These rates are not arbitrary but arise from a deliberate and thorough evaluation of each submission's scientific merit, methodological soundness, and editorial precision. Reviewers, selected for their expertise, offer detailed, often extensive reports that require authors to refine arguments, clarify methods, and enhance conceptual depth through multiple rounds of revision. Complementing this strict peer-review system is the meticulous work of the editorial office, which verifies references, cross-checks technical accuracy, inspects equations and variable definitions, and ensures coherence in figures, tables, and structural elements. Such practices significantly reduce errors and prevent any form of academic misconduct. The article presents illustrative cases demonstrating how WSEAS's layered scrutiny surpasses the norms of many contemporary publication venues, including those that prioritize rapid turnover. Through this combination of strict reviewing, comprehensive editorial oversight, and uncompromising ethical standards, WSEAS has established itself as a reliable and incorruptible academic publisher. Its consistent discipline and transparency place it in stark contrast to predatory or profit-driven journals, underscoring the value of its contribution to safeguarding scholarly integrity. Ultimately, WSEAS exemplifies a publication model in which rigor, fairness, and scientific responsibility form the foundation of credible academic dissemination. In an era where misinformation spreads rapidly through social media platforms, it has become increasingly common for academic publishers to face unfounded criticism from anonymous sources. The WSEAS has recently been the target of such attacks on platforms like Facebook, with detractors questioning the integrity of its review process. However, the evidence (both statistical and testimonial) tells a dramatically different story: WSEAS maintains one of the most rigorous, transparent, and incorruptible peer-review processes in academic publishing today.

Keywords: *Rigorous Peer Review, Editorial Integrity, Academic Publishing Standards, High Rejection Rates, Scholarly Quality Control, Reference Verification, Ethical Publishing*

Received: March 17, 2025. Revised: July 22, 2025. Accepted: October 11, 2025. Published: December 11, 2025.

1. Introduction

The academic publishing landscape is vast and diverse, with publication standards varying dramatically from one journal to another. Among the numerous international publishers, the WSEAS has distinguished itself as an organization with exceptionally rigorous editorial and peer-review practices. Scholars who have gone through their publication process frequently report experiences that reflect a high level of scrutiny, meticulous editorial checks, and an uncompromising commitment to academic integrity. This text aims to expand in detail on these observations, presenting an in-depth discussion of WSEAS's stringent rejection rates, the strictness of its reviewers, the thoroughness of its editorial office, and its reputation as a reliable, incorruptible publishing house. WSEAS has spent many years cultivating an identity rooted in high scientific standards. Its journals and conferences span numerous disciplines—from engineering and mathematics to computer science and the natural sciences—yet across these diverse fields, one consistent characteristic defines the organization: a dedication to quality over quantity. Unlike some publication venues that prioritize rapid turnover or financial gain, WSEAS emphasizes rigorous evaluation, transparent processes, and long-term credibility within the academic community. At the heart of this philosophy lies the belief that academic work must contribute meaningfully to knowledge. This contribution can only be ensured through exhaustive review processes, strict editorial oversight, and the enforcement of ethical standards that leave no room for manipulation or superficial scholarship. As a result, WSEAS has developed a well-earned reputation for maintaining high rejection rates and publishing only those papers that meet its demanding criteria. One of the strongest indicators of WSEAS's commitment to excellence is its notably high rejection rate. This rate is not the product of arbitrary gatekeeping but rather a reflection of the journal's willingness to invest significant time and resources in the review process. Submissions that do not meet the required

scientific depth, methodological rigor, or editorial precision are not hesitantly dismissed—they are rejected confidently in favor of maintaining the integrity of the publication. Authors often find this approach challenging, particularly those who are accustomed to more lenient venues. Yet, the high rejection rate serves an important purpose: it acts as a filter that ensures only high-quality manuscripts survive the review stages. For scholars whose work is accepted, this becomes a badge of honor—evidence that their research can withstand intense scrutiny. In an era when predatory journals proliferate and academic standards are under threat, the value of such selectiveness cannot be overstated. By upholding a high rejection rate, WSEAS signals its steadfast commitment to scholarship and its willingness to stand apart from low-quality outlets, even at the cost of publishing fewer papers. The strictness of reviewers in WSEAS journals is another defining aspect of the publication process. Reviewers are not simply volunteers offering casual comments; they are experts in their fields who follow a culture of deep engagement with each manuscript. Their reports are often lengthy, detailed, and precise, reflecting a genuine effort to elevate the quality of the submitted work. It is not uncommon for manuscripts to go through multiple rounds of revisions. Authors frequently receive extensive lists of required corrections, ranging from conceptual improvements and methodological clarifications to stylistic enhancements and technical adjustments. The process may continue through two or three rounds—sometimes even more—before reviewers feel satisfied that the paper meets the required standards. This level of thoroughness ensures that the final published work is polished, accurate, and fully defensible. Unlike journals that accept superficial revisions, WSEAS pushes authors toward excellence by demanding that every critique be addressed comprehensively. While the feedback may be strict, it is also constructive. Reviewers aim to improve the manuscript, not to discourage the author. Each recommendation tends to be accompanied by justification and often includes specific examples or references. This

environment encourages authors to reflect on their work deeply, rethink assumptions, refine arguments, and ensure their final product is both rigorous and coherent. Beyond the peer-review process itself, WSEAS's editorial office plays an equally crucial role in ensuring quality. The editorial team does not rely solely on reviewers; instead, it conducts its own comprehensive verification checks. This additional layer of scrutiny often surprises authors, particularly those who are accustomed to journals that overlook minor issues or inconsistencies. One of the most impressive editorial practices in WSEAS journals is the verification of references. The editorial office does not merely check that the reference list is formatted correctly; it verifies whether each reference actually exists, whether it is correctly cited, and whether its metadata aligns with the claims made in the manuscript. This meticulous attention to detail reflects the journal's commitment to preventing errors, misquotations, and—importantly—any form of academic misconduct. In cases where references cannot be located or verified, the authors are instructed to remove or replace them. Another area where WSEAS's editorial team excels is in the verification of technical details. This includes checking whether the numbering of equations is sequential and consistent, whether variables are defined correctly, and whether mathematical expressions match their corresponding explanations in the text. Such checks require significant time and effort, underscoring the seriousness with which WSEAS approaches academic precision. Many journals leave these tasks entirely to authors, ignoring inconsistencies that later undermine scholarly clarity. WSEAS, by contrast, treats these issues as essential components of academic integrity. The editorial office also ensures that captions in tables and figures align perfectly with the references made to them in the manuscript. If there are discrepancies—even minor ones—authors are required to correct them. This extends to cross-references, figure numbering, table annotations, and any related structural elements. Such attention to detail contributes to a smoother reading experience and prevents

misunderstandings or ambiguities within the article. Authors who publish through WSEAS often share similar stories of the intensity and thoroughness of the process. In one representative case, an author's article underwent three full rounds of peer review. After satisfying the reviewers' extensive comments, the author expected the paper to be accepted. Instead, the editorial office conducted an additional check and informed the author that two references could not be located in the databases. These references had to be removed, and the author was instructed to renumber all the equations accordingly. Despite the effort already invested in revisions, the editorial office insisted on these final corrections to uphold the journal's standards. This experience highlights two important aspects of WSEAS's editorial approach:

1. **Editorial rigor extends beyond peer review.**
2. **No detail is considered too minor when it comes to scientific accuracy.**

Such thoroughness may challenge authors but ultimately enhances the quality of the published work. The combined effect of strict reviewers, meticulous editorial checks, and a high rejection rate forms the foundation of WSEAS's reputation. Authors who succeed in publishing with WSEAS gain more than a publication—they gain the assurance that their work has passed through one of the strictest quality filters in academic publishing. Because WSEAS consistently demonstrates honesty, transparency, and discipline, it is widely regarded as a reliable publishing house. Scholars know that the organization does not compromise its standards under pressure, does not accept papers of questionable quality, and does not allow financial incentives to interfere with academic judgment. Perhaps the most admirable feature of WSEAS is the incorruptibility of its peer-review process. In an academic environment increasingly affected by predatory practices, manipulated reviews, and unethical editorial interventions, WSEAS offers an alternative model—one where fairness, merit, and scientific rigor dominate.

This incorruptibility strengthens the value of every article published under the WSEAS umbrella. To fully appreciate the role of WSEAS in the academic ecosystem, it is useful to compare its editorial practices with those of other publishers. In some journals, particularly those with rapid publication cycles or profit-driven models, peer review may be superficial. Reviewers may provide minimal feedback, and editorial offices may lack the resources or motivation to verify every technical detail. As a result, errors, inconsistencies, and unverified claims often slip into publication. WSEAS stands in stark contrast to such practices. Its insistence on strict review cycles, reference verification, and technical precision positions it closer to top-tier academic publishers, despite operating independently and often with fewer resources. The organization demonstrates that excellence does not depend solely on size or budget but on commitment, discipline, and respect for academic values.

2. The Numbers Don't Lie: An 80% Rejection Rate

WSEAS maintains an acceptance rate of approximately 20%, which translates to an 80% rejection rate—a figure that speaks volumes about the organization's commitment to quality control. This rejection rate is comparable to, and in some cases exceeds, that of many prestigious journals published by major academic publishers. When four out of every five submitted manuscripts are rejected, it becomes impossible to argue that the review process is lenient or perfunctory. The organization demonstrates remarkable transparency by making databases of all submitted articles publicly available, showing which papers have been accepted and which have been rejected. This level of openness is rare in academic publishing and stands in stark contrast to the opacity often found at predatory publishers.

3. Multi-Layered Quality Control: Beyond Basic Peer Review

Pre-Screening Quality Control

Before manuscripts even reach peer reviewers, WSEAS implements a comprehensive pre-screening process that includes:

1. **Plagiarism and self-plagiarism detection** using industry-standard tools like Turnitin and iThenticate
2. **Author verification** through Google Scholar to confirm publication history
3. **Affiliation validation** to ensure authors are affiliated with legitimate academic institutions
4. **Relevance assessment** to ensure submissions match the journal's scope

Approximately 20% of papers are rejected during this initial pre-screening phase, saving valuable reviewer time and ensuring that only potentially publishable work proceeds to peer review.

Rigorous Multi-Round Peer Review

Each manuscript is evaluated by a minimum of three independent reviewers, with WSEAS maintaining a network of nearly 14,000 reviewers across various disciplines. The review process typically involves:

- Initial evaluation by the Editor-in-Chief
- Assignment to topic-matched reviewers through an automated system
- Multiple rounds of revision based on reviewer feedback
- Final verification that all requested changes have been implemented

The organization requires authors to provide detailed responses to reviewer comments using standardized templates, ensuring accountability and thoroughness in addressing feedback.

Post-Review Editorial Verification

What sets WSEAS apart from many publishers is the meticulous post-review editorial verification process. As evidenced by my personal experience and confirmed by WSEAS's documented procedures, the Editorial Office conducts an additional layer of quality control that includes:

- **Reference verification:** Confirming that all cited references actually exist and are accurately formatted
- **Equation numbering:** Ensuring mathematical expressions are correctly numbered and sequenced
- **Figure and table caption consistency:** Verifying that captions in the text match those in the figures and tables
- **Formatting compliance:** Checking adherence to journal standards

This attention to detail goes far beyond what most journals provide. In my case, even after my manuscript had successfully passed through three rounds of peer review with positive evaluations from multiple reviewers, the Editorial Office identified two references that could not be verified and required their removal. They also requested that I renumber my equations for consistency. This level of scrutiny demonstrates an unwavering commitment to accuracy and quality that extends well beyond the standard peer-review process.

4. Certification and Transparency: An Industry-Leading Innovation

WSEAS has implemented a groundbreaking certification system that further ensures review integrity. Authors must sign a certification document declaring that they received substantial, line-by-line peer review with at least three positive evaluations from independent reviewers. The certification explicitly states: "If some authors feel that they have not received, at least, 3 positive opinions

from 3 independent reviewers with strong peer review, they should not sign this form." This certification is published alongside the article, creating a permanent public record of the review process. Any author who feels pressured or believes the review was inadequate can refuse to sign—and WSEAS will not publish the paper without it. This mechanism provides a powerful check against any potential misconduct and gives authors genuine agency in affirming the quality of the review they received. Additionally, all certifications and review evaluations are available to anyone upon request, demonstrating a level of transparency that is virtually unprecedented in academic publishing.

5. The Reviewer Network and Recognition

WSEAS has recruited nearly 15,000 reviewers, carefully vetting each one to ensure expertise and credibility. New reviewers are approved only after the Advisory Board verifies their publication records in respected databases such as Scopus, EI Compendex, SCIE, and ESCI. The organization participates in Publons (now part of the Web of Science Academy), allowing reviewers to receive formal recognition for their contributions. This integration with established academic recognition systems further demonstrates WSEAS's legitimacy and commitment to professional standards.

6. Documented Evidence: Papers Rejected by WSEAS, Accepted Elsewhere

Perhaps the most compelling evidence of WSEAS's rigorous standards is the organization's public database of papers that were rejected by WSEAS but subsequently accepted by IEEE, Springer, Hindawi, and other major publishers. This remarkable transparency—rarely, if ever, matched by other publishers—demonstrates that WSEAS's standards are not only high but in many cases exceed those of other respected academic publishers.

7. Editorial Board Credibility

WSEAS journals are led by distinguished academics from prestigious institutions worldwide, including professors from Harvard Medical School, MIT, Georgia Institute of Technology, and other leading universities. These editors-in-chief publicly certify and sign declarations confirming the substantial peer-review process and high rejection rates in their journals.

8. Personal Testimony: The Author's Perspective

As someone who has personally experienced the WSEAS review process, I can attest to its rigor and thoroughness. My manuscript underwent three complete rounds of peer review, with each round involving detailed feedback, substantial revisions, and careful evaluation by multiple independent reviewers. Each reviewer provided specific, technical comments that required careful consideration and response. But the process didn't end there. Even after the reviewers approved the manuscript, the WSEAS Editorial Office conducted their own independent verification. They identified issues that the reviewers had not caught—two unverifiable references and inconsistent equation numbering—and required me to correct these before publication. This demonstrates that WSEAS employs a multi-layered quality control system that extends beyond peer review to ensure the highest standards of accuracy and professionalism. This level of editorial attention is not window dressing. It reflects a genuine institutional commitment to publishing only work that meets exacting standards of quality, accuracy, and scholarly integrity.

9. Addressing the Criticisms

Anonymous criticisms on social media platforms like Facebook should be viewed with appropriate skepticism, especially when they contradict documented evidence and the

experiences of numerous published authors. Such attacks often come from:

- **Individuals whose work was rejected** and who are unwilling to accept that rejection based on merit
- **Competitors** seeking to damage a rival organization's reputation
- **Those with insufficient knowledge** of academic publishing standards and processes

The existence of a detailed, transparent, multi-stage review process with an 80% rejection rate, mandatory author certifications, publicly available rejection data, and post-review editorial verification makes the claim that WSEAS has a weak review process simply untenable.

10. Conclusion

The evidence overwhelmingly supports the conclusion that WSEAS maintains an exemplary peer-review and editorial process. With an 80% rejection rate, mandatory three-reviewer minimum, comprehensive pre-screening, post-review editorial verification, transparent certification requirements, and public availability of review data, WSEAS demonstrates a commitment to quality that meets or exceeds industry standards. My personal experience confirms what the data shows: WSEAS reviewers are demanding, the editorial process is meticulous, and the organization's commitment to accuracy and quality is unwavering. The post-review editorial checks—including reference verification, equation numbering, and caption consistency—demonstrate a level of care that many established publishers do not provide. Rather than giving credence to anonymous social media complaints, the academic community should recognize WSEAS for what it truly is: a rigorous, transparent, and highly professional publishing organization that plays a constructive role in advancing global scientific communication. The organization's openness about its processes, its high rejection rates, and its innovative certification system

should serve as a model for academic publishing as a whole. In an era where predatory publishing is a genuine concern, WSEAS stands as an example of how transparency, rigor, and accountability can combat skepticism and ensure the integrity of the scholarly record. Those who have experienced the process firsthand know the truth: WSEAS delivers on its promise of thorough, incorruptible peer review and meticulous editorial oversight.

References

- [1]. Lepadatescu, B., Ntalianis, K., Bulucea, A., Kazakos, D., Katehakis, M. N., Niola, V., Rudas, I. J., Neelov, I., & Bardis, N. (2025). The Rigorous Peer-Review Process in WSEAS Journals. Avoiding Predatory Publishers. *International Journal of Computers*, 10, 5-9.
- [2]. WSEAS. (2024). Peer Review Process. Retrieved from <https://www.wseas.org/cms.action?id=7671>
- [3]. Grudniewicz, A., Moher, D., Cobey, K. D., Bryson, G. L., Cukier, S., Allen, K., Arden, C., Balcom, L., Barros, T., Berger, M., Ciro, J. B., Cugusi, L., Donaldson, M. R., Egger, M., Graham, I. D., Hodgkinson, M., Khan, K. M., Mabizela, M., Manca, A., Milzow, K., Mouton, J., Muchenje, M., Olijhoek, T., Ommaya, A., Patwardhan, B., Poff, D., Proulx, L., Rodger, M., Severin, A., Strinzel, M., Sylos-Labini, M., Tamblyn, R., van Niekerk, M., Wicherts, J. M., & Lalu, M. M. (2019). Predatory Journals: What They Are and How to Avoid Them. *American Journal of Medicine*, 132(10), 1193-1198.
- [4]. Beall, J. (2012). Predatory publishers are corrupting open access. *Nature*, 489(7415), 179.
- [5]. Bohannon, J. (2013). Who's Afraid of Peer Review? *Science*, 342(6154), 60-65.
- [6]. WSEAS. (2024). Quality Control in WSEAS Publications. Retrieved from <https://wseas.org/cms.action?id=7669>
- [7]. Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE). (2017). Ethical Guidelines for Peer Reviewers. Retrieved from https://publicationethics.org/files/Ethical_guidelines_for_peer_reviewers_0.pdf
- [8]. Paliya, N., & Jha, S. S. (2024). Quality indicators for academic journals: What makes a journal trustworthy? *IP Indian Journal of Anatomy and Surgery of Head, Neck and Brain*, 10(4), 83-91.
- [9]. Marusic, A., Malicki, M., & Sambunjak, D. (2018). Updated Editorial Guidance for Quality and Reliability of Research Output. *Croatian Medical Journal*, 59(4), 126-131.
- [10]. Clarivate Analytics. (2024). Editorial Selection Process: Web of Science Core Collection. Retrieved from <https://clarivate.com/academia-government/scientific-and-academic-research/research-discovery-and-referencing/web-of-science/web-of-science-core-collection/editorial-selection-process/>