

Reviewing

A paper (or another kinds of texts), obtained by the editorial board is registered by the secretary, and either is accepted to a further work process or is declined — if: a) it doesn't follow to the rules for authors, b) it doesn't correspond to the topics of journal, c) a publication of paper will lead to a violation of professional or publishing ethics; as well as due to the other reasons, which will be reported to an author.

The manuscripts accepted for a further work process have to get an obligatory reviewing by no less than two specialists. In case of complexity or many sided character of the manuscript, and also if the reviewers' estimations are fundamentally different, the editorial board has right to send it for an additional review. The reviewer casting, based upon their specialization as well as the paper subject, is a prerogative right of the Editorial board of journal. An invitation of foreign scientists is possible.

A reviewer gets a manuscript with the name of author and his/her place of employment, i.e. with detailed information that is required to a journal publication. At the same time the reviewer anonymity is totally respected by the Editorial board.

The period of review is one month. In case of necessity of longer time (e.g., a participation in scientific field trip, etc.) a reviewer has to inform the Editorial board about these circumstances.

There are some criteria of manuscripts' reviewing:

- scientific originality;
- correspondence between the paper title and its content;
- correctness of keywords choice;
- correspondence between an aim and results of research;
- completeness of results' discussion and clarity of narration;
- informational value, sufficiency and visibility of tables and pictures
- informational value and presentation's clarity of summaries in Russian and English languages;
- completeness of references to the primary literature sources and its authenticity.

Correspondence between the author and the reviewer is conducted through the Secretary of the Editorial Board. An author has to answer on any comments either agreeing with it or arguing a different point of view. Both sides have to respect the [guidelines of ethics](#), not appealing to the personal individualities (political, ideological, religious, etc.) of each other. A reviewer may suggest the variants of editor's alterations including the title of paper, however an author has a right to advocate own statements.

There are some possible conclusions given by a reviewer:

- it's recommended to publish without changes;
- it's recommended to publish after some corrections;
- it doesn't need in an additional assessment;
- it needs in a recurrent or additional assessment by the specialist of certain specialization;
- it's recommended to decline.

All writing communication is kept in the archive of the Editorial Board during 5 years and can be submitted to an authorized agency for inspection.

The job of reviewers is not paid.