

PROCEDURE FOR REVIEWING ARTICLES
in the scientific and practical journal
"The Bulletin of Izhevsk State Agricultural Academy"

Every manuscript received by the editors of the scientific and practical journal "The Bulletin of Izhevsk State Agricultural Academy" (hereinafter referred to as the Journal) must undergo a review procedure. Author's original articles are accepted only if the requirements posted on the Journal's webpage on the Internet (www.izhgsha.ru) are met.

The manuscript of a scientific article is reviewed by the editor-in-chief for compliance with the scientific sphere of the Journal, the submission requirements and it is sent for review to a specialist. Reviewing is carried out by one of the members of the Editorial Board of the Journal, who has the closest scientific specialization to the topic of the article. The editors have the right to engage external reviewers (Doctors of sciences, including practitioners with recognized authority and working in the field of knowledge of the manuscript under review).

The Editorial Board reserves the right to reject the article or return it for revision. The author is obliged to improve the article in accordance with the comments of the reviewers or the Editorial Board. In case of rejection of materials a reasonable refusal is sent to the author along with a review. The editors do not enter into further discussions with the author.

The editor comes to an agreement with the reviewer about the date for submission the review to the publisher. In each individual case it is determined by the editors with the consideration of creating conditions for articles publication as promptly as possible.

Reviews are discussed by the Editorial Board and serve as the basis for accepting or rejecting manuscripts. The review is signed by a specialist with the printed last name, first name and patronymic, date, academic degree, academic title and position held by the reviewer.

The article submitted to the editorial office is registered. Manuscripts that do not take into account the Rules for the submission and publication of copyright materials and do not contain contact information about the authors responsible for correspondence are not considered and are not registered.

The review should evaluate the scientific article objectively and contain a comprehensive analysis of its scientific and methodological advantages and disadvantages. The review is compiled according to the standard form proposed by the editors (Appendix 1) or in free form, with the obligatory coverage of the following provisions:

- the relevance of the submitted paper. This section includes a brief justification of the conditions triggering the formulation and solution of the problem;
- scientific novelty of the direction of research considered in the paper. This should contain a brief description of the new scientific result obtained by the author (what he has proven, obtained, established, defined, proposed, etc.);

- the significance of the statement of the problem (task) or the results obtained for the further development of theory and practice in the area of knowledge under consideration. This section should show what exactly is being developed in the area of knowledge under investigation and how this can be applied and implemented in practical work;

- adequacy and modernity of research methods and statistical processing of materials;

- sufficiency of research material;

- the correctness of the discussion of the results;

- conformity of conclusions to the purpose and objectives of the study;

- quality of studying the literary sources (list of references);

- the admissibility of the volume of the manuscript as a whole and its individual elements (text, tables, illustrative material, bibliographic references);

- the expediency of placing tables, illustrative material in the article and their compliance with the topic;

- quality of article design: style, terminology, wording.

The final part of the review should contain reasonable conclusions about the manuscript as a whole and a clear recommendation on the advisability of its publication in the journal or the need for its revision.

In the case of a negative assessment of the manuscript as a whole (recommendation about the inappropriateness of publication), the reviewer must justify his conclusions.

If the manuscript does not meet one or more criteria, the reviewer indicates in the review the need to improve the article and gives recommendations to the author on improving the manuscript (with the indication of the inaccuracies and errors made by the author).

The editors bring to the attention of the author the result of the review. Articles improved by the author are re-sent for review to the same reviewer who made critical comments, or to the other reviewer at the discretion of the editors.

In case of conflict the review is provided to the author of the article without any information about the reviewer. If the author does not agree with the reviewer's comments, he can apply for a second review or withdraw the article, which is recorded in the registration log.

According to the results of the review, the article can be:

a) *rejected*. In case of refusal to publish the article, the editors send a reasoned refusal to the author.

Articles are not allowed for publication:

- articles that do not meet the requirements of the Editorial Board, the authors of which refuse the technical revision of the articles;

- articles whose authors do not fulfill the constructive comments of the reviewer or do not refute them reasonably.

The editors of the journal do not store manuscripts that are not accepted for publication.

b) *sent to the author for revision and improvement*. An article accepted for publication, but in need of revision, is sent to the authors with the comments of the

reviewer and editor. The authors should make all necessary corrections to the final version of the manuscript and return the revised text to the editorial office, as well as its identical electronic version, along with the original version and a cover letter-response to the reviewer (if necessary). After the improvement the article is re-reviewed, and the editors decide on the possibility of publication.

Manuscripts that have received the second negative result from the reviewer are not published and are also not returned to the author.

c) *accepted for publication*. Manuscripts accepted for publication are not returned. The final decision on accepting an article for publication and publishing it in one of the issues of the journal is made at a meeting of the Editorial Board of the Journal.

The Editorial Board informs the author of the decision at his request. Editors do not disclose information regarding the manuscript (including information about its receiving, content, review process, critical comments of reviewers and the final decision) to anyone other than the authors themselves and reviewers.

In accordance with the Journal's Publishing Policy and ethical standards for publications, reviewers are not allowed to make copies of manuscripts for their own use and are prohibited from giving part of the manuscript for review to another person without the permission of the editors. Reviewers, as well as editorial staff, do not have the right to use knowledge about the content of the work before its publication in their own interests. Manuscripts are the private property of the authors and are considered as highly confidential information.

If the publication of an article caused a violation of someone's copyright or generally accepted norms of scientific ethics, the editors of the Journal have the right to withdraw the published article.

Time period for consideration of articles is no more than 3 months.

Reviews are stored in the editorial office of the Journal for 5 years.

REVIEW

Of the manuscript of a scientific article (title):	
The author(s):	
Academic degree, academic title:	
1. Structure and content of the manuscript:	
Does the content of the article conform its title? (Yes/No)	
Are the right keywords chosen? (Yes/No)	
Is the relevance of the scientific problem justified? (Yes/No)	
Is the scientific problem formulated correctly? (Yes/No)	
Do the research materials have scientific novelty? (Yes/No)	
Are the conclusions correct? (Yes/No)	
To what extent are the results and formulated conclusions justified? "enough / not enough / no conclusions" (cross out or delete unnecessary)	
Have the author used his own or well-known methods properly? (Yes/No)	
Are there any errors in the methods used? (Yes/No)	
Are the illustrative materials and the results of the experiment correctly designed? (Yes/No)	
How exactly does the author follow the Rules for the design of the article? ("satisfactory / unsatisfactory")	
Drawings, photographs in the manuscript are appropriate (yes / no, which ones)	
There are errors and technical inaccuracy (yes, which ones / no)	
Cited bibliographic sources reflect the modern point of view on the problem under study and correspond to the content of the text (yes/no/absent)	
Is the proportion of literature references of the last 10 years sufficient? (can be specified as a percentage)	
Are keywords, an abstract, information about authors correct in English? (yes/no, which is incorrect)	
2. Scientific quality:	
the materials of the manuscript correspond to modern achievements of scientific and technical ideas	
the results are original	
the results are of scientific novelty, theoretical and practical significance	
the results make a significant contribution to the development of the field of science	
the manuscript contains fundamental errors	
3. Conclusion:	
publish without scientific editing	
the manuscript needs to be revised and re-reviewed	
the manuscript should be transferred to another specialist for review	
the manuscript cannot be accepted for publication	
4. Comments (recommendations, comments, specific proposals to eliminate the noted shortcomings, etc.):	

Information about the reviewer

Full name (in full):
Academic degree:
Academic title:
Position:
Full name of the organization of the place of work
Contact phone, E-mail:
" ____ " 20 ____ /signature/