



Ministry of Education and Science of the Russian Federation
Federal State-Funded Educational Institution of Higher Professional Education
“I. Yakovlev Chuvash State Pedagogical University”

Procedure

7.5G Research and Development

Regulations on article peer-review in “I. Yakovlev Chuvash State Pedagogical University Bulletin”

I ASSENT

Rector

_____ B. G. Mironov
“ ___ ” _____ 2012 г.

Regulations on
article peer-review in “I. Yakovlev Chuvash State
Pedagogical University Bulletin”

Version 1.0

Copy № _____

User _____
Full name

Cheboksary 2012

	<i>Position</i>	<i>Family name/ Signature</i>	<i>Date</i>
<i>Developed by</i>	<i>Head of the Printing and Publication Department</i>	<i>Ulyukova L.N.</i>	
<i>Checked by</i>	<i>Head of the Legal Department</i>	<i>Albutova L.N.</i>	
<i>Coordinated by</i>	<i>Pro-rector for Research and Innovation</i>	<i>Petrova T.N.</i>	
<i>Version 1.0</i>	<i>Without being signed the document is good for 8 hours after being printed. Date and time of printing is 06.05.2015, 10:52 AM</i>		<i>P. 1 of 4</i>



Ministry of Education and Science of the Russian Federation
Federal State-Funded Educational Institution of Higher Professional Education
“I. Yakovlev Chuvash State Pedagogical University”

Procedure

7.5G Research and Development

Regulations on article peer-review in “I. Yakovlev Chuvash State Pedagogical University Bulletin”

Contents

1. General Terms	3
2. Procedure of peer-review	3
3. Terms of peer-review	4
4. Reviewers	4
5. Reviewers’ payment	4

The statutes have been developed in compliance with the requirements of the Russian National Standard International Standards Organization 9004-2010 and are the document of the system of University quality management.

The amendments to this document are developed when there are amendments to the regulatory requirements on the authority of which the documents have been developed.



Ministry of Education and Science of the Russian Federation
Federal State-Funded Educational Institution of Higher Professional Education
“I. Yakovlev Chuvash State Pedagogical University”

Procedure

7.5G Research and Development

Regulations on article peer-review in “I. Yakovlev Chuvash State Pedagogical University Bulletin”

1. General Terms

1.1. Publishing articles in “I. Yakovlev Chuvash State Pedagogical University Bulletin” implies compulsory peer-review.

1.2. These regulations determine the procedure and forms of peer-review, reviewers, terms and conditions of payment for peer-review.

2. Procedure of peer-review

2.1. Only the articles performed in compliance with the article submission guidelines can be admitted to reviewing.

2.2. After determining the compliance of an article with the thematic scope of the Bulletin, it is sent to reviewers on behalf of the Deputy Editor-in-chief, Executive Editor (or Executive Secretary) without indicating the name of the author of an article. The reviewers are notified that the articles sent to them are copyright property and contain confidential information. Reviewers are not to copy or give to third parties.

2.3. After receiving articles, reviewers start reviewing. Referee reports are to be composed in free form, to contain a detailed analytical review and a substantiated evaluation of research (theoretical, methodical, conceptual) level of an article; degree of novelty of an author’s achievements; practical implications; contribution of an author’s achievements to developing the relevant field of knowledge, the list of faults of an article and their analysis, the statement that there is no plagiarism in the paper discussed, and also the conclusion on advisability of publishing the article under consideration or the conclusion on the denial of publishing and the improvement of the article.

A referee report is to be signed by a reviewer and witnessed by the Human Resources Department of a reviewer’s primary employment.

2.4. In case of favourable referee reports, the manuscript of an article is sent back to the editorial office to be published.

2.5. In case referee reports write about significant faults of an article and the necessity of the improvement of an article, the manuscript is sent back to the author to eliminate the faults. A finalized article may be reviewed again by the decision of the editorial staff. In case the article gets a negative referee report again after the second peer-review, the manuscript of the article will be declined and will not be considered any more.

2.6. In case the article gets a negative referee report, the editorial board of the Bulletin sends a substantiated refusal and referee reports (without indicating the reviewers’ names) to author(s).

2.7. The final decision on recommendation or denial of publishing an article is taken on the meeting of the editorial staff of the Bulletin by a majority vote.

2.8. Peer-review is confidential:



Procedure

7.5G Research and Development

Regulations on article peer-review in “I. Yakovlev Chuvash State Pedagogical University Bulletin”

a) the manuscript of an article is sent to a reviewer without indicating the name of the author of an article;

б) a referee report is sent to an author without indicating a reviewer’s name;

в) some deviation from confidentiality is permitted in case a reviewer finds it necessary to directly provide the author of an article with specific proposals on improving the article discussed.

2.9. Referee reports and recommendations are kept in the editorial office within 5 years from the day on which an issue with the reviewed article is released.

3. Terms of peer-review

3.1. The manuscript is reviewed after it is sent to the editorial office and after the author makes a contract on peer-review.

3.2. The term of peer-review is no more than 10 working days since a reviewer receives a manuscript.

3.3. In case some extra time is needed for peer-review, a reviewer can ask for more time but no more than 5 working days.

4. Reviewers

4.1. The members of the editorial staff of the Bulletin and also Doctors and Candidates of Science whose thematic scope coincides with the subject of an article can act as reviewers.

4.2. Reviewers are approved by the Editor-in-chief and the number of reviewers may be increased if necessary.

5. Reviewers’ payment

5.1. Peer-review is paid in compliance with the effective calculation rates judging the size of an article and an academic degree of a reviewer.

5.2. The calculation rates are approved by the Rector of the University.

5.3. Payment for peer-review is implemented in compliance with the contract for the paid rendering of services.