

RULES AND PROCEDURES OF REVIEWING SCIENTIFIC ARTICLES FOR THE “SOUTH OF RUSSIA: ECOLOGY AND DEVELOPMENT” JOURNAL

1. The articles submitted to the editorial board should correspond to the topics of the journal.
2. Initial examination is carried out by editors of the editorial department of “The South of Russia: Ecology and Development” journal. Initial examination includes the following: review of the supporting documents; estimation of the relevance of the scientific article to the journal profile, registration requirements and rules set by the editors of the journal, which are available on the journal’s website.
3. In case the manuscript of scientific article corresponds to the Journal profile, registration requirements and rules, it is accepted by the editorial board and sent to the reviewer. If the article does not match the required criteria it is rejected without further review.
4. All articles submitted to the journal are subject to peer review and editorial approval.
5. Reviewers are chosen from among the editorial board of a journal or the leading experts who have publications in the given field for the past three years.
6. The review deadline in each case is established in coordination with the reviewer according to the review contract, but should not exceed four weeks.
7. Forms of article review:
 - peer review by the specialist in a given field;
 - external review (author attaches two reviews written by the reviewers who are not related to the place of work (study) of the author. Reviews should be designed and approved in the prescribed manner; herein the editors reserve the right to conduct additional reviewing).
8. The reviewers must bear in mind that the articles sent to them are the intellectual property of their authors and are regarded as confidential information which is not to be disclosed. From this perspective the review will be conducted confidentially.
9. All participants who are responsible for preparing the manuscript for publication are obliged to inform the editorial board of a potential cause for conflict of interest. The author may indicate in a cover letter the names of experts who, in his/her opinion, should not review the manuscript if the author feels it may lead to the possible professional conflicts of interest. This information is strictly confidential and is taken into account in the process of review.

Reviewers are required to inform about the possibility of a conflict of interest when conducting the review and the reasons that may affect their judgment on the manuscript. They have the right to refuse to review a particular article, if they consider it justified. The editor appoints no external reviewer in case there is an evident possibility of a conflict of interest.

10. Reviewers submit a peer-review to the editorial staff in which they point out topicality of the conducted study, completeness and credibility of the submitted material, the scientific novelty of research. Reviewers determine the compliance of the proposed material with the general profile of the journal as well as artistic level of presentation (style, literacy of presentation, linguistic culture, etc.).

11. In conclusion, the review must include one of the following recommendations: “recommended” to be published in the Journal (with general remarks of the reviewer and recommendations for improvement if necessary), or “not recommended”.

12. In case of a positive review, the paper is presented at a meeting of the Editorial Board in order to decide on the issue of publication in accordance with the general order.

13. In case the reviewer recommends corrections in the given paper it shall be sent to the author (or the authors).

14. Corrected article is sent for scientific editing. Here science editor provides an opinion and recommendations for its publication.

15. In case of two negative reviews the author receives a reasoned refusal to publish the paper, certified by the editor in chief or his deputy.

16. If the second review is positive, the question of the publication of this article shall be presented at a meeting of the Chief Editorial Board.

17. Reviews are kept in editorial and publishing house for 6 years.

18. The content of each issue of the Journal is approved at a meeting of Chief Editorial Board of "South of Russia: the ecology, development", who decide on the acceptance for publication of each article taking into account the views of the reviewers.

19. After the Chief Editorial Board makes a decision on the admission of an article for publication the author is informed about it.

20. Review is available upon written request of the author or the expert council of the State Commission for Academic Degrees and Titles of the Ministry of Education and Science of Russia. Review is provided without a signature, first, second or patronymic names, position and place of work of the reviewer.