**RULESANDREGULATIONSforreviewingthemanuscriptssubmittedforpublicationin“Cherepovets State University Bulletin”**

**1. Organization of peer review process and peer reviewing procedure**

1.1 All manuscripts submitted to the Editorial Board are subject to obligatory peer-review.

1.2 Manuscripts submitted to the journal are sent for review according to the field of research to one of the members of the Editorial Board or to an independent reviewer who has a doctorate degree (Doctor of Sciences, Candidate of Science or PhD), is an expert in and has works published on the subject of the manuscript under review in the last 3 years.

1.3 A reviewer is appointed by the Editor in Chief or Deputy Editor in the corresponding field. The author or co-author of the manuscript under review cannot be its reviewer.

1.4 Peer-Reviewing is done within 10 working days following the receipt of the manuscript by the reviewer.

1.5 Peer-Reviewing is confidential and the text of the review is submitted to the author of the manuscript upon receiving a corresponding letter of request without signature, name, position, affiliation and place of employment of the reviewer.

1.6 The author is notified of the results of peer-reviewing within 10 working days following the receipt of the manuscript by the reviewer. The editorial staff informs the author of the manuscript about the conclusion of the reviewer by sending a copy of the review or a reasoned rejection by e-mail; the author is afforded an opportunity to read the text of the review.

1.8 A positive review is not a sufficient ground for publishing the article. The final decision on publication is taken by the Editorial Board.

1.9 If the review contains recommendation that the article should be revised and improved, it is forwarded to the author with the suggestion that the reviewer’s remarks should be taken into consideration when preparing a new variant of the manuscript. In that case the submission date shall be the date when the editorial staff receives the final variant of the revised manuscript.

1.10 If the review is negative, the decision to send the manuscript to another expert to be reviewed for the second time is taken by the Editor in Chief or by Deputy Editor in the corresponding field of study. If a manuscript receives two negative reviews, it is not subject to further consideration by the Editorial Board.

1.11 The articles written by post-graduate students are accepted for consideration only if a positive review of their academic advisor is submitted.

1.12 Reviews of the manuscripts are kept in the editorial office for the period of 5 years following the publication date of the articles.

1.13 The reviews can be submitted to the expert boards of the Higher Attestation Commission of the Ministry of Education and Science of the Russian Federation upon receiving a corresponding request.

1.14 All articles published in “Cherepovets State University Bulletin” are kept in the editorial office and are available.

1.15 The editorial staff provides the delivery of a statutory copy to the TASS News Agency (ITAR-TASS).

**2 Requirements to the review contents**

2.1 A review must contain a competent analysis of the subject matter of the manuscript with an objective and well-grounded appraisal and well-reasoned recommendations.

2.2 Peer-reviewing is done by recognized specialists in the corresponding field of study who have works on the subject of the manuscript published in the last 3 years. There is no special form for reviews which can be written in a free format.

2.3 A reviewer should pay special attention to highlighting the following:

- novelty and topicality of the article for the contemporary scientific knowledge;

- presence in the article of scientific findings and well-grounded conclusions;

- use of special terminology, methods and methodology;

- language and style of presenting the material;

- completeness of the reference list and appropriateness of the sources cited, presence of up-to-date sources;

- appropriateness and information value of tables, figures and illustrations in the manuscript under review and their correspondence to the subject under consideration;

- compliance of the manuscript length with the requirements stated, narrative logic and interconnection of the elements of the article.

2.5 Remarks and comments of the reviewer should be objective, well-reasoned, and aimed at raising the academic level of the article.

2.6 The closing part of the review should contain the conclusion regarding the compliance of the article with the requirements set for the works of such type and clear recommendation to publish the article in the open press within a certain scientific field corresponding to the list of scientific specialties approved by the Higher Attestation Commission of the Ministry of Education and Science of the Russian Federation.

2.7 If a manuscript in general is assessed negatively, the reviewer must justify such a conclusion in detail.
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