

Peer-review process

1.1. According to the established procedure, all scientific articles submitted to the editors of the journal are subject to mandatory review. The articles received with the internal review of a specialist are also subject to a peer review procedure, organized by the editors in the following order:

- ✓ the responsible editor determines the compliance of the article with the profile of the journal, the requirements for registration and, if necessary, sends the article for first consideration to the editor-in-chief or his deputy;
- ✓ sends for review to one of the members of the editorial board or an external expert reviewer, doctor or candidate of science who has the scientific specialization closest to the topic of the article;
- ✓ reviewers are notified that the manuscripts sent to them are the property of the authors and contain information that is not subject to disclosure. Reviewers are not allowed to make copies of articles.

1.2. Peer review is conducted confidentially for the authors of the article, is closed.

1.3. The terms of reviewing in each case are determined by the editor-in-chief taking into account the creation of conditions for the most efficient publication of the article, but do not exceed 30 days.

1.4. The review is provided to the author by his written request, without a signature and an indication of the name, position, place of work of the reviewer. A review with the personal data of the expert can be provided at the request of expert advice in the Higher Attestation Commission.

1.5. *The most important factors when analyzing a manuscript are:*

- ✓ compliance of the article with the journal profile;
- ✓ novelty of the results obtained and their significance for this field of science;
- ✓ presentation logic, persuasiveness of argumentation;
- ✓ clarity of wording, proper description of results and methodological approaches;
- ✓ lack of re-presentation of the results or statements presented in previously published sources;
- ✓ completeness of the list of references (its necessity, relevance and accessibility);
- ✓ informational content of tables, schemes, illustrative material.

1.6. *The reviewer undertakes to:*

- ✓ to provide, within a specified period of time, written, impartial comments on the scientific merits and value of work with a documented justification of the opinions of reviewers;
- ✓ assess whether the above is clear, accurate and relevant, evaluate the structure of work, scientific accuracy, originality and ability to interest readers of the journal;
- ✓ avoid personal comments and criticism;
- ✓ maintain the confidentiality of the review process: prohibiting distribution, discussion with third parties, or disclosure of information about the work under review.

1.7. If the review contains recommendations for correcting and finalizing the article, the editors send the reviewer's comments to the author with a proposal, either take them into account when finalizing the article, or reasonably refute them. The article, revised by the author, is resubmitted for review.

1.8. If the article is not recommended by the reviewer for publication, then the text of the negative conclusion is sent to the author, who, if he disagrees with the opinion of the reviewer, may contact the editorial office with a request to send his article for additional reviewing. In this case, the editorial board of the journal sends an article for repeated / additional reviewing or provides the author with a motivated refusal to publish. The final decision on this issue is made by the editor-in-chief, who is entitled to publish the article as a debatable one.

1.9. Having a positive review is not a sufficient reason to publish an article. The final decision on the feasibility and timing of publication after reviewing is made by the chief editor, and if necessary - by the editorial board of the journal.

1.10. The editors send the authors' reviews to the received materials in electronic form at the request of the Ministry without fail. In case of refusal in the direction for reviewing the manuscript submitted by the author, the editors send the author a reasoned response.

1.11. The originals of the reviews are stored in the editorial office for 5 years.