

**POSITION**  
**on reviewing scientific articles**  
**in the research and practice journal "Basis"**

**1. General Provisions**

1.1 This Regulation on reviewing scientific articles determines the procedure for reviewing the original author's articles (materials) received research and practice journal "Basis" (hereinafter – the journal).

1.2 Peer review (expert assessment), manuscripts of scientific articles in the magazine is carried out in order to ensure and maintain a high level of scientific and theoretical publications and for the selection of the most valuable and relevant (looking) papers.

1.3 Subject to peer review all presently materials for publication in the journal.

1.4 In this Regulation, used the following basic concepts:

**The author** – a person or group of persons (group of authors), who takes part in the creation of articles on the results of scientific research.

**Editor in Chief** – the person heading the editorial board makes the final decisions regarding the production and issue of the journal.

**Executive secretary of the editorial board** – a specialist, organizes and controls the planning, timely and qualitative preparation of materials for publication of the magazine.

**Plagiarism** – intentional appropriation authorship of another work of science or art, other's ideas or inventions. Plagiarism may be a violation of copyright law, patent law, and as such may result in legal liability.

**Editor** – a representative of the scientific journal or publishing house, prepare materials for publication, and also supports communication with authors and readers of scientific publications.

**Editorial Board** – an advisory body of eminent persons group, which has a chief editor of the aid in the selection, preparation and evaluation of works for publication.

**Reviewer** – expert acting on behalf of the scientific journal or publishing house and conducting scientific expertise copyright material in order to determine the possibility of their publication.

**Review** – review procedure and peer review of the proposed reviewers to the publication of a scientific article to determine whether it should be published, identifying its advantages and disadvantages, which is important for the improvement of the manuscript by the author and the publisher..

## **2. The procedure for the consideration of the primary article**

2.1 The editorial board accepts for consideration articles and materials that meet the scientific profile of the journal. Materials that do not meet the subject of the journal, will not be accepted.

2.2 Article accepted for consideration by the journal, provided that it meets the author's original article (material).

2.3 Materials are accepted Edited by e-mail at [shat155@mail.ru](mailto:shat155@mail.ru) as follows:

– carefully proofread copy of the article, decorated according to the publication requirements, have never been published and contains bibliographic list that includes at least two sources and not more than ten sources;

– abstract (brief description of the article thematic content) – 150–250 words, key words – 6–10 words and phrases.

– translation of the information about the author, summary, keywords and title of the article;

2.4 Article Submissions must be open. The existence of restrictions is grounds for rejection of the material from the open publication.

2.5 Notification of the authors receipt materials is carried out in the executive secretary of the 3-day period.

2.6 The manuscript of a scientific paper, received by the editorial board, considered the executive secretary for completeness of the package and compliance with the documents submitted manuscript (article) the requirements of the editorial board, the journal's profile and the rules of registration. In the case of non-compliance with conditions of publication the article can be sent to the author for revision.

2.7 The corresponding profile of the journal and the requirements for publication of the article is sent for review.

## **3. The procedure and the procedure for review of manuscripts**

3.1 All articles received by the editorial board, are subject to mandatory review (peer review).

3.2 By reviewing the scientists involved with a recognized authority and working in the field of knowledge to which the content of the manuscript. The reviewer should have a degree of Doctor or Candidate of Sciences.

3.3 Reviewers are required to follow the adoption of provisions on the ethics of scientific publications in the research and practice journal "Basis".

3.4 The magazine adopted a four-level system of review articles:

**Level 1** – the text check on the availability of borrowed text - is mandatory for all entries. The editorial staff reviews all articles through the "Anti-plagiarism". When the original text below 75% (the loan from one source can not be more than 7%), the article is sent to the author for revision, with justification. Not allowed borrowing from sites of student work.

**Level 2** – an open review (open peer review – authors and reviewers know each other) – Review by the author, at his request or at the request of additional editorial board;

**Level 3** – sided "blind" review (single-blind - the reviewer knows about the author, the author of the reviewer - not) - is mandatory for all entries. Reviewer for an article assesses the relevance of the topic and scientific innovation, as well as its structure and style of presentation. All comments and suggestions are made to an article in the review (Appendix 1). If the comments made by the reviewer, eliminated, then the article is sent to the author for revision. The editorial staff reserves the right to refuse to publish the author, who wishes to leave the comments from reviewer unattended. Reviewer also has the right to carry out additional checks on the use of loans in the text of the publication by selectively copy portions of the text and check through the available Internet search system;

**Level 4** – two-way "blind" review (double-blind - authors and reviewers do not know about each other) is used in the case of ambiguous characteristics article reviewer appointed by the mandatory review. Editor together with the Editorial Board may recommend the article for additional review.

3.5. The reviewer should consider aiming article in a timely manner and send to the editor by e-mail or a duly executed a review, or a reasoned refusal to review.

3.6. Terms of the review in each case determined in view of creating the conditions for the most rapid article publication, but not more than 15 days receipt of the application for publication by the journal. The period may be extended, if necessary, additional review and / or temporary absence of the reviewer's profile.

3.7. The editorial board recommends that reviewers use a standard form of review.

As a result of the review the reviewer submits to the editorial board and the editorial board of one of the following decisions:

- recommend the article for publication;
- recommend the article for publication after processing / removal of comments;

– does not recommend the article for publication.

3.8. If the reviewer recommends an article to be published after completion / remove comments or not recommend the article for publication in reviews must contain specific reasons for the decision with a clear formulation of substantive and / or technical deficiencies identified in the manuscript, indicating specific pages if necessary. Comments and suggestions of the reviewer should be objective and principled, aimed at improving the scientific and methodological level of the manuscript.

3.9. The review of submissions to the journal is carried out in compliance with the confidentiality and the name of the reviewer to the author (s) are not reported.

3.10. The originals are stored in the reviews of the magazine within 3 years. At the request of the Ministry of Education and Science of the Russian Federation (Ministry of Education) the review must be submitted to the Higher Attestation Commission and / or the Ministry of Education.

3.11. To publish articles graduate students and applicants degree of candidate of sciences and Editorial Board of the journal entitled to an editorial addition to the above recommendation to reviews to demand profile of the department, which, however, does not exclude the usual order of review.

#### **4. The decision to publish**

4.1. After receiving the reviews at the following meeting of the editorial board discusses the incoming articles and opinions on the basis of reviewers' final decision on the publication of articles or to refuse publication. The decision of the editorial board adopted by a simple majority vote. At equality of votes, the chief editor is crucial. The quorum for a decision is set at 50% of the total number of members the editorial boards.

4.2. In the final decision on acceptance or refusal of the article in the publication of the journal editorial board is drew attention to the urgency to be solved of the science problem. Review should clearly describe the theoretical and applied significance of the study, the author's conclusions relate to the existing scientific concepts. An essential element of the review is to assess the reviewer's personal contribution of the author in solving the problem. It is worth noting in a review of compliance with the style of presentation logic and the availability of the scientific nature of the material, as well as the reliability and validity of the conclusions (assessed the representativeness of practical material, called to analyze the degree of illustrating the cited authors are quantitative data, and so on.).

Review completed overall assessment and recommendation of the article for publication, revision or a reasoned rejection of the material.

4.3. On the basis of the decision to the author(s) on behalf of the executive secretary sent an e-mail outlining the decision on the presented materials.

4.4. If the article can be published after revision and elimination of the comments in the letter provides recommendations for revision / removal of comments. Reviewers and editors do not enter into a discussion with the authors about the made comments.

4.5. Article directed by the author (s) in the revised edition / removal of comments are re-reviewed at the same or another reviewer - appointed at the discretion of the publisher.

4.6. If you have a significant proportion of the reviewer's criticisms and the overall positive recommendation, the editorial board can be attributed material to the category of polemical and publish it in the manner of scientific discussion.

4.7. In the case of deviations from published articles Editorial Board sends the author a reasoned refusal.

The article did not recommend a reviewer for publication, to reconsider is not accepted.