

2. The rules of articles review

1. Reviewing manuscripts of scientific articles in "Vestnik of Samara State University of Economics" is carried out to maintain a high level of scientific and theoretical publications and for selection of the most valuable, relevant, promising scientific papers.

2. There is an anonymous review in "Vestnik of Samara State University of Economics":

a) the referee does not get author / authors' personal data;

b) the author / authors do not get reviewer's personal data.

3. Received scientific articles are to be primarily controlled on completeness and correctness of registration in accordance with the Rules of articles.

4. The primary peer-reviewing of scientific articles is carried out by the editor in chief or deputy editor.

5. The editor in chief (deputy editor), looking through the article, determines a reviewer or a member of the editorial board, supervising the appropriate direction (scientific discipline).

If the member of the editorial board is absent, supervising the appropriate direction (scientific discipline), the editor in chief (deputy editor) defines an external reviewer.

Reviewers (as members of the editorial board, so as external ones) should be recognized experts on the subject of the peer-reviewed articles and have publications on peer-reviewed articles over the past three years.

6. All articles are subject to mandatory review.

7. After the peer review of the scientific article the reviewer can:

a) recommend the article for publication;

b) recommend the article for publication after the article refinement;

c) not to recommend the article for publication.

If the reviewer recommends an article to be published taking into account all comments, or does not recommend an article to be published, the review should justify the reasons for such a decision.

9. Reviewing scientific articles reviewers have to:

- Pay attention to the material:
- Formulation of the scientific problem (task);
- Relevance to solve scientific problems;
- Theoretical and applied significance of research;
- Correlating the author's findings with existing scientific concepts, reliability and validity of conclusions;
- Description of the main results of the study, findings.

10. Papers may be submitted for further review. The grounds for re-reviewing are:

- a) expert (s) declares about insufficient qualification in matters dealt with in the scientific article;
- b) disputable provisions made in the scientific article.

11. The reviewer sends the reviewed article to the editor in the form of scanned copies by e-mail or in hard copy by mail.

12. The editorial board sends to authors copies of reviews or reasoned refusal. At the same time in order to save anonymity of this review the editorial board "dehumanizes" the review, sending the copy of the review to the author concerning the substance of the article, but without revealing the personal details of the reviewer.

The editorial board sends the copies of reviews to the Ministry of Education and Science of the Russian Federation when requested.

13. Reviews are stored in editor's office for 5 years.