

## Regulations

on reviewing original author's articles submitted for publication in the scientific journal " Academy's Herald "

### 1. GENERAL PROVISIONS

1.1. This Regulation regulates the procedure for reviewing author's original articles (materials) and the requirements for reviews submitted to the editorial office of the scientific journal " Academy's Herald " (hereinafter referred to as the "editorial Board").

1.2. Peer review (expert evaluation) of manuscripts of scientific articles in the editorial office is carried out in order to select the most valuable and relevant (promising) scientific works that ensure the maintenance of a high scientific level of the journal as a whole.

1.3. All materials submitted for publication in the journal are subject to review.

### 2. RULES FOR SUBMITTING MATERIALS FOR REVIEW

2.1. Scientific articles designed in strict accordance with the conditions and procedure for accepting manuscripts are allowed to be reviewed.

2.2. The materials of the article should be open. The presence of a restrictive vulture serves as a basis for rejecting the material from open publication.

2.3. Subject to the requirements, the editorial board accepts the manuscript of the article. The editor-in-chief directs it for review.

### 3. ORGANIZATION OF THE REVIEW

3.1. Scientists with recognized authority, working in the field of knowledge, to which the content of the manuscript belongs and having for the last three years are involved in reviewing.

Employees of third-party scientific organizations may be involved for reviewing. The reviewer must have a doctor's or candidate's degree.

3.2. The Editorial board uses a two-level system of reviewing articles:

1st level – checking the text of the article for the presence of a borrowed text. Required for all articles. The editorial board checks all articles through the "Anti-Plagiarism" system. If the originality of the text is below 85% (while borrowing from one source cannot be more than 7%), the article is sent to the author for revision with appropriate justification. Borrowing from student work sites is not allowed.

The 2nd level is a two-way "blind" review (double-blind – the author and the reviewer do not know about each other.

3.3. The reviewer must review the article sent to him in due time and provide the editorial board with a properly executed review, or a reasoned refusal to review.

3.4. The terms of reviewing in each individual case are determined taking into account the creation of conditions for the most expeditious publication of the article, but no more than 15 days from the date of receipt of the application for publication by the editorial board of the journal. The term may be extended if additional review is necessary and/or the temporary absence of a profile reviewer.

3.5. The review of materials submitted to the editorial board of the journal is carried out with confidentiality, and the name of the reviewer is not reported to the author(s).

3.6. The original reviews are kept in the editorial office of the journal for 5 years. At the request of the Ministry of Education and Science of the Russian Federation (Ministry of Education and Science), reviews must be submitted to the Higher Attestation Commission and/or the Ministry of Education and Science.

#### 4. REQUIREMENTS FOR REVIEWS

4.1. The Editorial Board recommends using a standard form when reviewing.

4.2. In agreement with the editor-in-chief, it is possible to compile a review in a free form.

4.3. The review should objectively evaluate the scientific article and contain a comprehensive analysis of its scientific and methodological advantages and disadvantages; include a reasoned assessment of: the scientific (theoretical, methodological and conceptual) level of the article; the relevance of the problem posed in the article, scientific novelty of the material, originality; scientific and practical significance of the research; reliability of the information provided by the author; correctness and the accuracy of the definitions and formulations used (introduced) by the author; the validity of the conclusions drawn; the representativeness of the practical material involved in the analysis; the degree of illustrativeness of the examples, tables, figures given by the author; a general list and analysis of all the shortcomings noted, as well as a statement of the absence of plagiarism and a general conclusion about the expediency of publishing the article or rejecting and refining it.

A necessary element of the review is the reviewer's assessment of the personal contribution of the author of the article to the solution of the issues under consideration. The review should also evaluate the logic, language and style of presentation of the material, their compliance with the requirements and norms of literary and scientific language.

4.4. Based on the results of the review, the reviewer submits one of the following decisions for consideration by the editorial board of the journal:

- the article is recommended for publication in the journal (without modifications);

- the article is recommended for publication in the journal, subject to revision (without re-reviewing);

- the article requires revision and re-review;

- the article is not recommended for publication in the journal.