

**Autonomous non-profit organization for higher
education**

«Russian New University»

Accepted by the
Academic Council of
ANOHE «Russian New University»
Protocol of 14th October 2015
№ 67/96



Ratified by
Rector of ANOHE
«Russian New University»
V.A. Zernov

10 _____ 2015

**Regulations on the peer-reviewing procedure of
manuscripts
received by the editorial board of
«Vestnik of Russian New University»**

Moscow

2015

1. GENERAL REGULATIONS

A reviewed scientific journal is a journal that publishes articles reviewed by specialists. Editorial boards of series of the journal "Vestnik of Russian New University" include well-known scientists and specialists in interdisciplinary fields of knowledge corresponding to the columns of the journal's scientific series. Editorial boards create a base of experts and specialists (reviewers) who actively work in one of the scientific fields corresponding to the subject matter of the journal's series. While creating a base of experts they take into account repute of a candidate's name in academic circles, his/her experience of reviewing, conscientiousness and sense of responsibility.

1.1. All scientific articles that come to the editorial office (considering all requirements to the authors, including the requirement to submit one review) are to be reviewed additionally.

1.2. The person who is responsible for publishing a particular issue determines whether the manuscript of the submitted article complies with the journal's subject matter.

1.3. The editorial board member who supervises one of the series' scientific directions and is in charge of publishing a particular issue, forwards the article for reviewing to a specialist, Doctor of Science or Doctor of Philosophy who is a recognized scientist in the subject matter of the reviewed article and has publications in the subject matter during the last three years.

1.4. The Doctor of Science or Doctor of Philosophy who reviews the article cannot be the article's author or co-author.

1.5. Reviewing of the article is to be done in a confidential atmosphere. Reviewers are informed that the articles that are forwarded to them are the authors' intellectual property and are confidential. Submitting a manuscript for reviewing, the author trusts the reviewer with the results of his/her scientific work and creative efforts that have a great impact on his/her reputation and career. Breach of confidential information concerning the manuscript's reviewing violates the author's rights. Reviewers are not to give any information concerning the manuscript (including the information on its receipt, content, and process of reviewing, the reviewer's critical remarks and final decision) to anyone except for the author. Breach of confidentiality is possible only in the case of unauthenticity or falsification of the materials; in all other cases confidentiality is mandatory.

1.6. Reviewers are not allowed to make copies of the reviewed articles for their own needs. They are not to use knowledge of the work's content in their own interests before the article is published.

1.7. The editorial board member supervising one of the series' scientific directions is in charge of the reviews' quality and timeliness of writing the reviews of the articles' manuscripts.

1.8. The managing editor of a particular series comes to an agreement with the reviewer about the deadline of submitting the review to the publishers. In each case the deadline is set by the editorial staff to create conditions for publishing the article as soon as possible.

1.9. Reviews are certified according to the procedure established by the institution where the reviewer works.

1.10. All the reviewers are to acquaint themselves with the present Regulations.

1.11. All the materials in reviewing are stored in the editorial office of the journal (Vestnik RosNOU).

2. REQUIREMENTS TO THE CONTENT OF THE REVIEW

2.1. The review is to contain qualified analysis of the article's material, its objective and reasoned evaluation and well-grounded recommendations.

2.2. The reviewer ought to pay special attention to covering the following questions:

- Analysis of urgency of the article's topic and its scientific level.
- Compliance of the article's content with its title.
- Evaluation of whether the article is ready for publishing or not in terms of the language and style, and compliance with the requirements on the layout of the article's materials.
- Scientific presentation of the material, compliance of the methods, methodologies, recommendations used by the author as well as research results with modern scientific achievements.
- Adequacy and rationality of the article's size in general and the size of its particular elements (text, visual material, bibliographical references). Appropriateness of placing visual material in the article and its accordance with the article's topic.

- Place of the peer-reviewed manuscripts in the historiography: whether it duplicates or not the work of other authors or previously published works of the same author.
- Factual inaccuracies and errors admitted by the author.

2.3. Reviewer's comments and suggestions should be objective, essential and aimed at improving the scientific level of the manuscript.

2.4. The final part of the review should contain well-founded conclusions on the article and a clear, unambiguous recommendation of the expediency or in expediency of its publication.

3. Procedure of manuscripts peer-reviewing

3.1. The decision concerning publication is taken by the editorial board of the journal and is based on reviews containing expert opinions of reviewers, compliance with the thematic focus of the scientific journal, their scientific significance and relevance. In

some cases, journal's editorial board takes decision concerning publication on the session of editorial board.

3.2. Upon peer-reviewing article can be:

a) rejected

In case an article is rejected in publication editorial board send to the author a motivated refusal.

Article is denied in publication if: it is not prepared in accordance with editorial board standards; author refuses to technically revise an article; author neglects constructive comments of reviewer or refutes them without sound argumentation.

In case of disagreement with reviewer's opinion author has the right to give a reasoned response to the editorial board of the journal. Article can be re-directed to another expert for peer-reviewing purposes by the decision of the editorial board.

If an article gets two negative reviews author is sent a reasoned refusal to publish the work, certified by the chief editor or his deputy.

b) sent to the author for revision

Article is accepted for publication after it is sent to the author with the comments of reviewer and editor and improved by the author. Authors should apply all the necessary corrections in the final version of the manuscript and return corrected text to the editor, as well as its identical electronic version with the original version and the accompanying letter of response to the reviewer.

Revised article is reviewed again by the same reviewer who made critical comments and editorial board makes decision on the publication. Articles sent to authors for correction should be returned to the editorial board no later than 7 calendar days after have been received. Late return of the article results in change of publication date.

c) accepted for publication

The presence of positive reviews is not sufficient grounds for the publication of the article. The final decision on publishing author's article in the scientific journal is carried out on the sessions of the editorial board.

4. Final statements

4.1. Editorial board of the scientific journal does not keep manuscripts that were not accepted for publication. Manuscripts accepted for publication will not be returned to the author. Manuscripts that received negative comments from the reviewer are not published and are not returned to the author.

4.2. The Editorial Board sends to author a copy of reviews and informs about the decision upon his request. The author of unaccepted for publication article is sent a motivated refusal upon author's request.

4.3. Editors do not report information concerning the manuscript (including information on its receipt, content, review process, reviewers' criticisms and final decision) to anyone other than the authors and reviewers.

4.4. The editors reserve the right to make editorial changes to the text of the article without distorting its meaning (literary and technical editing).

4.5. The originals are kept in the editor's office of "Vestnik of Russian New University" for five years. Editors send copies of reviews to the Ministry of Education and Science of the Russian Federation upon request.

4.6. If publication of the article has caused a violation of anyone's copyright or standard norms of scientific ethics, the editors of the scientific journal are entitled to withdraw published article.

4.7. Brief messages, letters to the editor, reviews, discussion papers, personalities, etc., pass only primary expert evaluation of editorial board in accordance with scientific field and are not passed to the external review.