

Peer-Review Process of manuscripts submitted to the journal

1. All scientific manuscripts submitted to the editorial team of the Journal are undergone to compulsory peer-review process according to the approved order.
2. The Editors establish the correspondence of the manuscript to the profile of the journal, and sends it for the first consideration to the executive editor who determines the scientific value of the manuscript and appoints a reviewer. Articles are peer-reviewed by the members of Editorial Board, and also by top experts who are not part of the Editorial Board, working in the fields corresponding to the topic of the manuscript.
3. Peer-Review Process is performed confidentially. The author of the peer-reviewed manuscript is afforded an opportunity to have a look at the text of the review. From after 2014 the Editors will move to the double "blind" peer review procedure, i.e. the reviewer will not know the author's name either.
4. Reviewing time is 3 weeks. This period is controlled by editors, depending on the situation, and at the request of the reviewer this period can be prolonged.
5. With the aim to obtain the most complete and objective review, the editorial staff has worked out the instruction notice with a list of questions the highlighting of which in the manuscript the reviewer must assess. Based on this assessment, the reviewer makes his conclusion on the fate of the manuscript: the manuscript is recommended for publication a) in its present form, and b) taking into account the correction of the drawbacks specified by the reviewer, and c) the manuscript is to be reviewed additionally by another specialist; d) the publication is rejected.
6. If in the review there are contained recommendations for correction and refinement of an manuscript, the head of the editorial team sends to an author the text of the review suggesting him to take suggested recommendations into consideration when preparing a new variant of the manuscript or reasonably dispose them (completely or partially). The refined by the author manuscript is sent for peer-review process repeatedly.
7. If an author and the reviewer have insoluble contradictions concerning the manuscript, the editorial board has a right to send the article to be reviewed by another reviewer. In conflict situations the manuscript can be given to the one of the members of the Editorial Advisory Board and in such cases the irreversible decision is made by the Editor-in-Chief.
8. An article not recommended for publication by a reviewer is not received for a reconsideration. The negative review report is sent to the author by e-mail, fax or by post.
9. The positive review is insufficient for the manuscript to be published. The editorial board makes the irreversible decision relying on the feasibility of the work and its correspondence to subject of the journal. In conflict situations the decision is made by the Editor-in-Chief. The decision of the Editorial board on the each manuscript is recorded in the minutes of the meeting of the Editorial Board.
10. Original copies of reviews are kept in editorial office for three years.

Instruction notice for the reviewer

In the assessment of the manuscript and the writing of the review, the reviewer must adhere to the following questions:

1. The originality of the work, the novelty of the data obtained
2. The completeness and accuracy of representation of the problem in the review literature
3. Rationale
4. Correspondence of the manuscript to the current state of the issue under study
5. Clarity of the description of goals and tasks of the work, their correspondence to the factual material
6. Particularity in descriptions of materials and methods
7. The adequacy of the choice of methods of the study
8. The adequacy of the statistical analysis
9. Relevance of the results to assigned aims of the research study
10. Availability of evaluation of findings
11. The validity of conclusions
12. The scientific value of the results of the work
13. The practical significance of the results of the work
14. Visibility of the presentation of the material (the presence of tables, figures)
15. The presence of comparison of own data with the reported in literature
16. The presence of links to all relevant publications on the topic of the work
17. The quality and volume of the Summary
18. Compliance of the work with ethical norms