

REGULATION

on the procedure for reviewing articles submitted for publication in the journal “Vestnik of Kostroma State University”

1. Review organising and procedure.

1.1. All scientific articles submitted to the editorial office are subject to mandatory review.

1.2. Reviewing typescripts of articles submitted for publication in the journal “Vestnik of Kostroma State University” is organised by the editorial board. Responsibility for the quality of reviews and timeliness of reviewing typescripts of articles is allocated to the journal's editor, the editorial board members and the executive secretary.

1.3. The examination is of a closed nature, the review is provided to the author of the article at its written request indicating neither the reviewer's signature nor the name, position or place of work.

1.4. The final decision on the adoption of the author's article and its placement in one of the journal's issues is made at the journal's editorial board meeting. The editorial board shall inform the author, at its request, of the decision taken. The author of the article not accepted for publication is, at its request, provided with a motivated refusal by the editorial board.

1.5. To conduct a review of articles' typescripts, both members of the editorial council and editorial boards of the scientific periodical “Vestnik of Kostroma State University” and highly qualified scientists and specialists of Kostroma State University and other organisations and enterprises, who have deep professional knowledge and experience in the specific scientific field, can be involved as reviewers. A reviewer cannot be the author or the co-author of the peer-reviewed work.

1.6. Reviewing articles' typescripts is part of the official duties of teachers and professors of Kostroma State University and it is taken into account in the individual plans of the staff.

1.7. Articles' typescripts reviews shall be kept in the editorial board of the journal's thematic series for five years from the day of publication of the articles, and they shall be provided at the request of expert councils of the Higher Attestation Commission of the Russian Federation.

1.8. In the case of a reviewer's favourable response and recommendation of the material for publication, the typescript and text of the review are considered at a meeting of the editorial board of the journal. The fact of a positive review is not yet a sufficient basis for the publication of the article. The decision on the feasibility of publication is made by the editorial board.

1.9. If the reviewer points to the need to refine the material, then the typescript is returned to the author. In this case, what is considered to be the date of receipt of the article to the editorial office, is the date of return of the revised typescript. Clarification of aspects needing improvement is made by the journal's executive secretary based on the received review.

1.10. If the reviewer does not recommend the article for publication, then the review and the type script are considered at a meeting of the editorial board of the journal, where the editorial board either rejects the article, or still decides to allow the material to be published after it is transferred to another reviewer.

If two negative reviews are received, the typescript is no longer considered by the editorial board.

1.11. The postgraduates' articles are accepted and submitted for review only if there is a positive feedback from their scientific supervisors.

2. Review content requirements.

2.1. A review shall contain a qualified analysis of the article's material, its objective, reasoned assessment and essential recommendations.

2.2. A review may be prepared by the reviewer in free form or in the form of an expert questionnaire approved by the editorial board.

2.4. What should to be given special attention in the review, is coverage of the following issues:

- general analysis of the scientific level, terminology, structure of the article, its topicality;

- evaluation of the preparation of the article for publication with regard to language and style;

- compliance of the article materials with the established requirements for registration;

- scientific character of statement, compliance of methods, techniques, recommendations used by the author as well as investigations results with modern achievements of science and practice;

- admissibility of the volume of the article as a whole and of its individual elements (text, tables, illustrative material, bibliographic references);

- desirability of placing tables, illustrative material in the article and their conformity with the topic;

- place of the peer-reviewed work among others, those already published on a similar topic – what is new in it, how it differs from them, if it duplicates the works of other authors or previously printed works of the same author (both in general and in particular);

- inaccuracies and errors made by the author, recommendations to the author and to the editorial board to improve the typescript.

2.5. The reviewer's comments and wishes shall be objective and fundamental, aimed at raising the scientific and methodological levels of the typescript.

2.6. What the review's final part shall contain, is justified conclusions about the article as a whole and a clear recommendation on the advisability of publishing it in the said journal in a specific scientific direction, which corresponds to the nomenclature of scientific specialties approved by the Higher Attestation Commission of the Russian Federation.

2.6. In the case of a negative response to the typescript as a whole, the reviewer shall justify its conclusions particularly convincingly.