

Review Process

1. All the scientific articles submitted to the editorial office of the journal are subject to mandatory peer-reviewing. Editorial board carries out reviewing of all submitted materials in corresponding to subjects of the journal, for the purpose of their expert estimation. The review of articles is carried out in compliance with the ethical principles adopted by the editorial board of the journals.
2. The editor-in-chief determines if the article complies with the subject-matter of the journal and the layout requirements, and sends the article to the expert for peer-reviewing.
3. The reviewers involved in reviewing of materials are recognized experts in subjects of reviewed materials and have publications on subjects of reviewed articles within last three years.
4. The reviews are discussed by the Editorial Board and serve as a ground for acceptance or rejection of manuscripts.
5. In each individual case, the deadlines for peer-reviewing are specified by the executive secretary of the journal, taking into account the creation of conditions for the quickest possible publication of articles.
6. The review must include the following items:
 - the relevance of the article content to the problem stated in the title;
 - the importance of the problem;
 - the scientific novelty of concepts, contained in the article;
 - the theoretical and practical importance of the research results;
 - the thoroughness in the study of literary sources (list of references);
 - the expedience for inserting tables and illustrative materials in the article, and their relevance to the stated problem;
 - the quality of the article layout (style, terminology, formulations);
 - the strong points of the article;
 - the weak points of the article, along with recommendations for correcting the mistakes and inaccuracies made by the author.
7. The reviewer fulfills a standard form of the review approved by an editorial board and states the reasoned judgments (up to 1 page) and recommendations on improvement of work quality in a free form. The final part of the review must contain the substantiated conclusions on the article as a whole; the recommendation on desirability of its publication, in view of correcting the noted shortcomings, or the well-grounded justification for denial of publication.
8. The review is presented both in the printed form and on the electronic media and it must be signed by the peer-reviewer.

9. Editorial board sends a copy of the review or a reasoned refusal to the authors of the presented materials. If the review contains recommendations concerning revision and finalization of the article, then the text of the review is sent to the author with the proposal to consider these recommendations in finalizing the article or to disprove them with deep arguments (complete or partial). The article, finalized or revised by the author, is resubmitted for peer-reviewing.

10. The article which is not recommended for publication by a peer-reviewer can not be accepted for re-examination. The text of the negative review is sent to the author by e-mail, fax or regular mail.

11. After a month after submission of the article to the editorial office, the editorial board notifies the author of the results of peer-reviewing and publication term.

12. The review is stored in editorial office within 5 years.

13. Journal editorial board directs a copy of reviews to the Higher Attestation Commission of the Ministry of Education and Science of the Russian Federation by the corresponding inquiry.