

**Aim of reviewing** – increase of quality of scientific articles published in the journal by means of assessment of materials by highly qualified experts.

The following issues are considered in reviews:

- whether article contents correspond with its subject (set in title);
- whether article contents correspond with subject directions of the journal;
- whether article contents have certain novelty;
- whether article corresponds with the scientific level of the journal;
- whether article publication is expedient, taking into account earlier publications on this issue and whether it is of interest for a wide circle of readers;
- what exactly are positive sides and shortcomings of the article; what corrections and additions (if any) should be introduced by the author.

The review procedure is anonymous both for reviewer and for the authors and is performed by two independent reviewers (double “blind” reviewing). Editorial Board guarantees anonymity of reviewers.

The peer-reviewing involve domestic and foreign experts. Peer-reviewers are usually selected randomly based on their current load and with their consent.

All reviewers shall stick to requirements of the [Committee on Publication Ethics](#) with respect to ethics in scientific publications and to be objective and impartial.

Reviews and recommendations for each article are stored in the Editorial Office in the electronic form during 2 years from the date of issue of the journal edition, where the reviewed article is published.

Only those articles, which were prepared in strict accordance with the « [Technical requirements](#) » and that passed primary control of the Editorial Board, would be passed over for reviewing. In the case of availability of remarks at the stage of primary control, the article can be sent back to

the author on the grounds specified in «  
[Reasons for refusal](#)  
».

The following articles are not reviewed:

- a) articles, the authors (co-authors) of which are members of the Editorial Board of the Bulletin;
- b) articles, which are written by request of the Editorial Board.

Term of making recommendations – 1 month since the moment of the article reception on editorial email.

The final decision for the article is taking during a meeting of the Editorial Board, which is held once a week and composed of: Chief Editor, Deputy Chief Editor, Executive editor. The decision is made with consideration of the received reviews.

Decision of the Editorial Board is sent to the author(s).

Articles that are subject to revision are sent to the author(s) together with the text of the review, which contains specific recommendations on revision of the article. The revised variant of the article is sent for the second reviewing. In the event the second review is also negative, the article is rejected and is not subject to further consideration.

**EDITORIAL BOARD DOES NOT ENTER INTO ARGUMENTs WITH AUTHORS OF REJECTED ARTICLES.**

