

REGULATIONS ON THE ORDER OF REVIEWING ARTICLES SUBMITTED FOR PUBLICATION IN THE JOURNAL «TECHNOLOGIES & QUALITY»

1. Arrangements and procedures for review.

1.1 All scientific articles submitted to the Editorial Board are subject to mandatory reviewing.

1.2 Reviewing of articles the typescripts of which are submitted for publication in the journal «Technologies & Quality» is organized by the Editorial Board. Responsibility for the quality of reviews and timeliness of typescript reviewing is assigned to the journal Editor, members of the Editorial Board and the Executive secretary of the journal.

1.3 The reviewing is of a closed nature.

1.4 Final decision on acceptance of an author's article and its placement in one of the journal issues is made at the meeting of the Editorial Board. The Editorial Board informs the author about the decision by the author's request. Author of an article which has not been accepted for publication is sent a reasoned refusal by the Editorial Board upon author's request.

1.5 Both members of the Editorial Board or editorial council of the scientific journal «Technologies & Quality» and highly qualified scientists and specialists of Kostroma State University or other organizations and enterprises, which possess profound professional knowledge and experience in a particular scientific area, can be involved as reviewers for reviewing typescripts of articles. A reviewer cannot be the author or the co-author of the reviewed work.

1.6 Reviewers are notified that typescripts sent to them are intellectual property of authors and refer to information which is not subject to disclosure. Breach of confidentiality is possible only in case of claim of inaccuracy or falsification of materials.

1.7 Reviews on typescripts of articles must be stored in the editorial office for five years from the date of publication of articles and be presented at the request of expert councils of the Higher Attestation Commission of the Russian Federation.

1.8. In case of a positive review and if the reviewer recommends the material for publication, the typescript and the review text are considered at the meeting of the Editorial Board of the journal. Availability of a positive review is not a sufficient basis for publication of an article. Decision on the advisability of publication is made by the Editorial Board.

1.9 If a reviewer points out the need to improve the material, the typescript is returned to the author. In this case, what is considered to be the date of receipt by the Editorial Board is the date of return of the finalised typescript. Articles finalised or revised by the author are sent for reviewing again.

1.10. If a reviewer does not recommend an article for publication, it is possible to send the article for repeated reviewing. If two negative reviews are received, the typescript is no longer considered by the Editorial Board of the journal for publication.

1.11. Articles of postgraduate students are accepted and submitted for review only in the presence of a positive review of the supervisor.

2. Content requirements for the review.

2.1 A review must contain a qualified analysis of the article material and objective, and it must contain reasoned assessment as well as justified recommendations.

2.2 A review can be prepared by the reviewer in a free form.

2.3 The issues to be given special attention to in the review include:

- general analysis of the scientific level, terminology, structure of the article, its topicality;
- evaluation of the article's preparedness for publication with respect to language and style;
- compliance of the article materials with the established design requirements;
- scientific presentation, compliance of the methods, techniques, recommendations and results of investigations used by the author with the modern achievements of science and practice;
- admissibility of the volume of the article as a whole and its separate elements (text, tables, illustrative material, bibliographic references)
- the appropriateness of placing tables and illustrations in the article and their relevance to the subject

– the place of the work under review among others already published on a similar theme – what is new in it, how it differs from the latter, whether it duplicates the work of other authors or previously published works of the article’s author (both fully and in part)

– inaccuracies and mistakes made by the author, recommendations to the author and the Editorial Board for improvement of the typescript.

2.4 Comments and wishes of a reviewer shall be objective and principled, aimed at improvement of scientific and methodical level of a typescript.

2.5 The final part of the review shall contain reasonable conclusions about the article as a whole and a clear recommendation about the expediency of its publication in this journal on a particular scientific area corresponding to the nomenclature of scientific specialties approved by the Higher Attestation Commission of the Russian Federation, and to a particular rubric of the journal.

2.6 In case of negative assessment of the typescript as a whole the reviewer must substantiate its conclusions particularly convincingly.