

## Manuscripts reviewing rules

1. The journal editorial office follows the so-called "semi-blind reviewing" procedure, when the authors do not know the names of the reviewers.
2. All the manuscripts submitted to the journal are reviewed by two independent reviewers.
3. The requests for reviewing are sent to the specialists, including editorial board members, whose scientific interests correspond to the manuscript research area, including editorial board members.
4. The terms of the review delivery are determined in every specific case by the journal editorial office and reviewer, taking into consideration the necessity to reduce the publication duration. The average reviewing time is 15-21 day.
5. The reviewing is a confidential procedure. An exception to this rule can be only in the event when a reviewer states on a plagiarism, uncertainty or adulteration of the information set forth in the manuscript.
6. Composite author is informed on the review contents.
7. Obtaining of two positive reviews is a basis for decision of the editorial board to publish the manuscript.
8. In the event that the manuscript requires correcting, it (together with the reviews) is being sent to the authors for improvement, and its corrected version should be returned back during three weeks.
9. In the case, when the recommendations of the reviewers are opposite, the manuscript is being sent to the third reviewer.
10. In the event, when the authors do not agree with the reviewer, they have a right to submit their well-reasoned objection for consideration of the editorial office.
11. Conclusive decision on the publication of the manuscript in this case makes the journal's editorial board. Composite author of the manuscript is informed on this decision.

## Requirements to contents of review

The review should contain:

1. The manuscript title, surnames, initials, positions, places of employment of the manuscript authors.
2. Concise description of the problem considered in the manuscript. It is to the point to indicate the method used in the studies and its novelty.
3. The importance of the manuscript topic and concise justification of such an assessment
4. The most important results of the study. The estimation of the study results and authors recommendations importance.
5. The recommendation of the reviewer on the manuscript publication or declining with an assessment of its conformity with the journal requirements.
6. Review date
7. Rank, academic degree, position, place of employment, surname and initials of the reviewer.

Due to imperfection of the system of reviews processing and publication in the eLibrary, the text of the review should not contain formulas, equations, graphs and tables. The system perceives only text.