

**MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION
FSBEI HE ULYANOVSKY SAU**

Russia, 432017, Ulyanovsk, Noviy Venets Boulevard, 1.
Tel.: 8 (8422) 55-95-83

ORDER

**of review of manuscripts submitted to the Editorial Board of
scientific and theoretical journal**

"Vestnik of Ulyanovsk State Agricultural Academy"

Approved at the meeting of the Editorial Board of the Journal

"Vestnik of Ulyanovsk State Agricultural Academy"

"1" June 2022

Record No. 3

Each manuscript (hereinafter referred to as the Article) submitted to the Editorial Board of the scientific and theoretical journal "Vestnik of Ulyanovsk State Agricultural Academy" (hereinafter referred to as the Editorial Board of the Journal), necessarily undergoes a review procedure.

The author has the right to submit a review of the Article independently signed by an independent specialist in the relevant field of science and / or practice. In this case, the Editorial Board has the right to send an article for an additional review.

The manuscript of a scientific article submitted to the Editorial Board of the Journal is reviewed by the editor-in-chief and the executive secretary of the Editorial Board of the Journal within a 2 week period, for the compliance of the Article to the specialization of the Journal, for the execution requirements, it is registered in the record book of the manuscripts received for editing and it is sent for specialist review, doctor or candidate of science, who has the scientific specialization closest to the subject of the article.

For reviewing the articles submitted to the publication, the Editorial Board of the Journal engages leading scientists in the relevant field of scientific knowledge. The reviewers can be members of the Editorial Board of the Journal, as well as highly qualified independent experts and practitioners. The reviewer must have a scientific degree of a candidate or a doctor of sciences and experience in practical work in this field for at least 5 years, publications on the subject of the article under review over the last three years. The scientific supervisor of the author can not be involved in the review. The article is submitted to the reviewer in printed and (or) electronic form. Reviewers are notified that the articles sent to them are private property of the authors and contain information that can not be disclosed. Reviewers are not allowed to make copies of articles and transfer it to third parties.

Review is conducted confidentially for the authors of articles, it bears insular nature. The review is given to the author of the manuscript at his written request, without signature, name, position, and workplace of the reviewer.

A review with an indication of the author of the review can be given at the appropriate request of the expert councils to the HAC.

Violation of confidentiality is possible only if the reviewer submits that the material contained in the manuscript has been unreliable or falsified.

The period for review is determined by the executive secretary of the Editorial Board and is established in agreement with the reviewer, taking into account the conditions for the most expeditious publication of the Article, but may not exceed one month from the delivery of the manuscript to the reviewer. The reviewer has the right to refuse reviewing within one week from the receipt of the manuscript and notify the editorial board of the Journal in writing.

The review covers the following issues:

- whether the content of the article corresponds to the topic stated in the title;
- compliance of the article with modern achievements of scientific and theoretical thought;
- whether the article is understandable to the readers it is addressed to, in terms of language, style, material layout, visualization of tables, diagrams, figures and formulas;
- whether the publication of the article is appropriate, taking into account the previously published materials;
- the positive aspects, as well as the shortcomings of the article, what corrections and additions should be made by the author.

The reviewer has the right to give recommendations to the author and the Editorial Board on improving the manuscript. The comments and feedback of the reviewer should be objective and principled, aimed at increasing the scientific and methodological levels of the manuscript.

The final part of the review should contain substantiated conclusions about the manuscript in general and a clear recommendation on the appropriateness of its publication in public media and contain one of the following solutions:

- recommend to accept the manuscript for publication in public media;
- recommend to accept the manuscript for publication in public media with technical corrections;
- recommend to accept the manuscript for publication in public media after the author eliminates the reviewer's amendments to the article, with subsequent review conducted by the same reviewer;
- recommend to refuse publishing the article in public media because of its inconsistency to the requirements of the scientific standard of the Journal (in this case, the article not recommended by the reviewer, is not reconsidered).

In case of a negative evaluation of the manuscript as a whole, the reviewer must convincingly substantiate his conclusions. A copy of the negative review is sent to the author by e-mail, fax or regular mail.

If the review contains recommendations for correcting and improving the article, the author is given the text of the review with the improvements to be taken into account when preparing a new version of the article, or to contradict them (partially or completely). The article (revised) by the author is sent again to the review.

In case of disagreement with the opinion of the reviewer, the author of the article has the right to contact the Editorial Board of the Journal with a reasoned request in writing about sending his manuscript for review to another reviewer; appropriate convictions are to be given. In this case, the editorial board of the Journal sends the manuscript to a second (additional) review, or provides the author with a reasoned refusal. A positive review is not a sufficient basis for the publication of the article. The final decision on the appropriateness and timing of publication after reviewing is taken by the editor-in-chief, and if necessary, by the editorial board of the Journal as a whole.

The Editorial Board of the Journal informs the author about the taken decision, upon his written request, by sending a written, reasoned response by e-mail, fax or regular mail.

The editorial board is obliged to send copies of the reviews to the Ministry of Education and Science of the Russian Federation upon receipt of the corresponding request to the editorial office.

The editorial board of the Journal does not store manuscripts which have not been accepted for publication. Manuscripts accepted for publication are not returned. Manuscripts that received a negative result from the reviewer are not published and are not returned to the author.

The original copy of the reviews shall be kept in the Editorial Board of the Journal within five years from the date of their signing by the reviewer.