

Procedure of reviewing scientific articles

1. Research papers, received by editorial board, answering the subjects of the journal, prepared in accordance with the requirements, undergo a peer-reviewing procedure.
2. In case of rejection of sending a manuscript to revision, author receives a reasoned reply.
3. We examine only previously unpublished manuscripts.
4. At author's discretion, external review can be presented when submitting an article. This does not exclude the usual procedure of reviewing.
5. Chief editor determines, whether an article answers the subject of the journal and meets the requirements, and forward it to reviewing to examination with PhD or ScD degree, who is a recognized expert on the subject of peer-reviewed material.
6. Reviewers are notified, that all manuscript are the property of authors and contain information, that should not be disclosed. Reviewers are not allowed to make copies of articles. Reviewing is confidential. Breach of confidentiality is possible only when there is a statement for invalidity or falsification of materials. In all other cases it's preservation is obligatory.
7. Manuscript is passed to a reviewer without any information about the authors.
8. Time constraints for the procedure of reviewing is defined by the chief editor, individually for each case. Maximum reviewing period (between the date of acceptance of the manuscript by the editor till the editorial board makes it's decision) is 2 months.
9. The following items are pointed out in the review:
 - a) a compliance of the matter of an article with it's title;
 - b) an assessment of the relevance of the content of a manuscript;
 - c) an assessment of the form of the presented materials;
 - d) an appropriateness of publishing an article;
 - e) a description of the advantages and disadvantages of an article.

In the final part of the review of the manuscript, on the basis of it's analysis, clear conclusions should be given, whether the publication can be published as is, or there is a need for its revision or processing (with constructive comments).

1. If the review contains recommendations for editing and (or) finalizing an article, it is sent to an author with a proposal to take into account the recommendations in preparing a new version of an article or arguments to refute them. An improved paper is sending back for reviewing.
2. In a case, where the reviewer does not recommend an article to publication, editorial board may send back an article to be rewritten, taking into account the comments made on it, as well as send it to another reviewer. Text of a negative review is also sent to an author.
3. Manuscripts, which receives contradictory reviews, should be forwarded to an additional reviewing. If a manuscript receives two negative reviews, publisher has a right to reject the submitted manuscript immediately and not to publish it.

4. The final decision on publication of an article is taken by the chief editor together with the scientific editor .
5. When a positive decision on publishing an article is taken, the author is informed. Text of a review is sent to an author via Internet.
6. Originals of the reviews are stored at the editorial office for five years.
7. On demand of the Ministry of Education and Science, the reviews are also sent to the Higher Attestation Commission and / or the Ministry.
8. The editors do not undertake any obligation on time constraints of publishing the manuscript.
9. Not prescribed to an obligatory reviewing:
 - interviews and reports from the round tables, conferences, etc.;
 - news , information and advertising messages and announcements.