

## 1. Review

Each manuscript submitted for consideration by the journal is sent for review. The author bears full responsibility for the scientific content of the article, references, citations, description of sources, as well as for the observance of copyrights of third parties.

### COMPLIANCE WITH THE BASIC REQUIREMENTS OF THE JOURNAL

The submitted manuscript goes through the process of primary evaluation in terms of compliance with the formal requirements: the subject of the journal, the rules for the design of the manuscript (the standard IMRAD format: introduction, methods, results, discussion and conclusion), the originality, clarity and consistency of the material, the availability of complete data about the authors.

In case of non-compliance with these formal requirements, the manuscript is not accepted for further consideration, of which the Editorial Board notifies the author, indicating the reason for the refusal within 15 days from the receipt of the manuscript by the Editorial Board.

*If the technical editor detects a large amount of plagiarism in the text (more than 50% of borrowings), the use of technical methods to increase the assessment of the originality of the text in the Antiplagiarism system, the fact of the low scientific quality of the article, the fact of the previous (earlier) publication of the article, the manuscript is rejected without the right to its further processing or improvement.*

Manuscripts that have successfully passed the check for compliance with the basic requirements of the journal go to the next stage of consideration – peer review.

### REVIEW OF MANUSCRIPTS – DOUBLE BLIND (ANONYMOUS)

The reviewer and the author do not know each other's names, and receive a letter with comments from the executive secretary of the journal.

Manuscripts are reviewed by:

- members of the editorial board;

- by the decision of the editor-in-chief by invited reviewers, specialists who have a Ph.D. or Doctor of Science degree and who have published materials over the past 3 years in reputable Russian and foreign journals on the topic of the reviewed manuscript.

The choice of one or another reviewer for the examination of the manuscript is made by the executive secretary of the journal.

## REVIEW TERMS

The term of review is from 2 to 4 weeks from the moment the reviewer receives the manuscript. In exceptional cases, at the request of the reviewer, it can be increased. Each reviewer has the right to refuse a review if there is a clear conflict of interest that affects the perception and interpretation of the manuscript materials.

Copies of reviews can be provided upon request to the Ministry of Science and Higher Education of the Russian Federation.

## CONTENT OF THE REVIEW

The review is compiled in the form of a journal with a mandatory detailed justification of the decision made by the reviewer on the manuscript (Appendix A). The submitted review should contain conclusions about:

- relevance and correctness of the formulation of a scientific problem;
- compliance of the content of the manuscript with the goal;
- substantiation of the scientific novelty of the reviewed manuscript and contribution to science;
- how much does the literature review presented in the paper correspond to the latest achievements of domestic and foreign science;
- argumentation of scientific results;
- clarity, logic and completeness of the presentation of the material;
- the quality of a list of references;
- proposal for revision of the manuscript;
- assessment of the essence of the work and the possibility of its publication in the journal.

The review, together with the file of the reviewed manuscript, should be sent to the e-mail address of the editorial office [vestnik\\_sgeu@mail.ru](mailto:vestnik_sgeu@mail.ru) from the e-mail address of the reviewer within the agreed period, but no later than within 21 days from the date of receipt of the manuscript by the reviewer. The reviewer must promptly respond to the editorial board, in case the authors have questions, giving explanations to their comments and recommendations.

Based on the results of the review, the Reviewer can recommend the manuscript:

- for publication;
- for revision with subsequent re-review;
- do not recommend the manuscript for publication.

Copies of reviews are sent to the authors.

If the Reviewer recommends the manuscript for publication after revision, taking into account the comments, or does not recommend the manuscript for publication, the review should indicate the reasons for such a decision.

If the review contains recommendations for correcting and finalizing the manuscript, the editors of the journal send the author the text of the review with a proposal to take them into account when preparing a new version of the manuscript or to refute them with arguments (partially or completely). Finalization of the manuscript should not take more than 3 months from the date of sending an e-mail to the authors about the need to make changes. The manuscript modified by the author is re-sent for review.

If falsification or fabrication of the research results is revealed in the text, the article is rejected without the right to its further processing or revision.

If the authors refuse to finalize the materials, they must notify the editors of their refusal to publish the manuscript by e-mail. If the authors do not return the revised version after 3 months from the date of sending the review, even in the absence of information from the authors with a refusal to finalize the manuscript, the editors remove it from the register. In such situations, the authors are sent an appropriate notification of the removal of the manuscript from registration due to the expiration of the time allotted for revision.

If the author and reviewers have irresolvable contradictions regarding the manuscript, the editorial board has the right to send the manuscript for additional review. The review time is counted from the date of receipt of the manuscript by a new reviewer.

A manuscript that is not recommended for publication by the decision of the editorial board is not accepted for re-consideration. A notice of refusal to publish is sent to the author by e-mail.

*The presence of a positive review is not a sufficient basis for the publication of the manuscript.*

#### EXPERTISE ON THE POSSIBILITY OF OPEN PUBLISHING

Articles that have an expert opinion on the possibility of open publication are allowed for publication. Examination of the possibility of open publication is carried out centrally by the Publisher.

*The final decision on publication is made by the editor-in-chief based on a positive review and an expert opinion.*

#### PREPARATION OF THE MANUSCRIPT FOR PUBLICATION

Upon receipt of a positive conclusion, the manuscript is placed in the "portfolio" of the journal for final editorial preparation for publication. The structure and content of the issues is approved by the editor-in-chief or his deputy. The editors inform the author, indicating the terms of publication, depending on the order of priority in accordance with the subject of the journal. The preparation of the manuscript for publication, carried out by the Editorial Board of the journal, consists in monitoring the consideration of the comments of reviewers, literary editing and bringing the text to the editorial standards adopted in the journal. Editorial changes are agreed with the authors.

At all stages of the review process, the Reviewer is guided by the ethical principles in the activities of the reviewer, described in the Publication Ethics section.

Reviews are kept by the Editorial Office for 5 years.