

# **RULES FOR THE REVIEWING**

## **of articles submitted for publication in the Journal**

### ***Perm University Herald. Series “Philosophy. Psychology. Sociology”***

#### **1. GENERAL PROVISIONS**

**1.1.** Present Rules regulate the order of reviewing of author’s original articles (manuscripts) and specify requirements for reviews submitted to the Editorial Board of the journal *Perm University Herald. Series “Philosophy. Psychology. Sociology”* (hereinafter referred to as «the Editorial Board»).

**1.2.** Reviewing (expert evidence) of manuscripts is realized by the Editorial Board to select the most valuable and relevant (promising) articles for maintaining a high level of the scientific journal, as well as promotion of relevant research is realized through estimation of manuscripts by highly qualified experts.

**1.3.** All manuscripts submitted for publication in the journal is required for reviewing.

**1.4.** The following definitions are accepted for present Rules:

Author is the person or the group of persons (the group of authors) that are involved in the creation of article based on the results of scientific research.

Editor-in-Chief is the person that is in charge of the Editorial Board and takes final decision in regard to production and issue of the journal.

Executive Editor is the person that organizes and supervises the work of the Editorial Board in regard to planning and timely and qualitative preparation of manuscripts for printing.

Plagiarism is the intentional appropriation of authorship of someone else's work of science or art, other people's ideas or inventions. Plagiarism may be a violation of copyright law, patent law and as such may entail legal liability.

The Editorial Board is an advisory body consisting of authority figures that provide help for Editor-in-Chief in the selection, preparation and evaluation of manuscripts before publication.

Reviewer is the person that represents the journal or publisher and gives expert evidence of author’s manuscripts for determining the possibility of its publication.

Reviewing is the procedure composed of examination and expert evidence of submitted article and realized by reviewers for the purpose of determining the appropriateness of its publication. Reviewing contributes to identify strengths and

weaknesses of a paper that is important for improvement of the manuscript by the author and the Editorial Board.

Manuscript is a work of science presented by the author for publication in a journal (type-written).

## **2. RULES FOR SUBMISSION OF MATERIALS FOR REVIEWING**

**2.1.** The Editorial Board admits for examination only the articles prepared in strict accordance with Guidelines for English-speaking authors.

**2.2.** If the article matches the subjects of the journal and meets the requirements for registration, the Editorial Board will accept the manuscript for consideration. Editor-in-Chief sends it for reviewing.

## **3. THE ORGANIZATION OF REVIEWING**

**3.1.** The Editorial Board enlists scientists for reviewing of articles. These scientists must be recognized authority on the field of knowledge to which the article belong and must have publications on the subject of peer-reviewed article in the last three years.

The Editorial Board can enlist research workers from other research organizations.

The reviewer should have PhD degree.

**3.2.** Reviewers are required to follow accepted at Perm State University «Ethic standards of editorial line».

**3.3.** The authors, who are referred to doctoral students, postgraduate students or competitors of scientific degrees of candidate or doctor of sciences, need to send to the Editorial Board a review written by scientific supervisor or scientific consultant in any format with justification of the relevance and compliance with the requirements for registration of the article. In addition postgraduate students need to submit a certificate (certified by the seal) confirming their status (from the educational (scientific) organizations).

**3.4.** The Editorial Board welcomes outside reviews (as a supplement) provided by specialists having PhD degree from other cities and organizations working in the field of knowledge to which the article belong and already having the publications on the subject of peer-reviewed articles in the last three years. Outside reviews do not relieve the submitted articles from reviewing that is required for all incoming manuscripts.

**3.5.** The Editorial Board uses the following system of reviewing of scientific articles:

The first level is dedicated to checking a content of the article on the availability of the borrowed text. This procedure is obligatory for all articles. The Editorial Board verifies all submitted articles through the system «Antiplagiat». If the amount of genuine text is below 75% (thereby borrowing from one source may not be greater than 7%), the article will send back for revision with the appropriate justification. However, there are specific exceptions in the case of some humanitarian studies.

The second level is open peer reviewing, wherein author and reviewer know each other. This reviewing is provided by the author according to his/her desire.

The third level is blind reviewing, wherein author and reviewer do not know each other.

**3.6.** If it is necessary, manuscripts may be sent for additional review (involving up to three reviewers).

**3.7.** The reviewer considers the article directed to him/her in target dates and provides duly executed review or reasoned refusal of reviewing to the Editorial Board.

**3.8.** The target dates of reviewing is determined by considering the creation of conditions for the most rapid publication of article. However this period cannot be more than 30 days from the date of receipt of an application for publication by the Editorial Board. This period may be extended in case of necessity for additional review and/or in case of temporary unavailability of the profile reviewer.

**3.9.** On the basis of reviews and recommendations the Editorial Board takes one of the following decisions:

**3.9.1.** If all reviews are positive, the manuscript will be approved for publication in one of the issue of the journal.

**3.9.2** If there are disagreements among the reviewers, the final decision about publication of the manuscript will be made by Editor-in-Chief.

**3.9.3.** If reviews contain significant observations and conclusion about necessity of revision of the article, the manuscript will be returned to the author for removal of comments. A modified version of the article can be sent for re-reviewing on the decision of Editor-in-Chief. In the case of repeated negative result of reviewing a manuscript is rejected and is not subject to further review.

**3.10.** The originals of reviews are kept in the office of the Editorial Board for 5 years. Reviews must be submitted to the Higher Attestation Commission and/or to the Ministry of Education and Science at the requests of the Ministry of Education and Science of the Russian Federation.

**3.11.** The author has the right to see the text of review.

#### **4. REQUIREMENTS TO REVIEWS**

**4.1.** The editorial Board recommends using a standard form for reviewing (Appendix 1).

**4.2.** Reviewers may compile their reviews in the any format in agreeing with Editor-in-Chief.

**4.3.** The review should objectively evaluate scientific article and contain the comprehensive analysis of its scientific and methodological advantages and disadvantages. The review should include reasoned assessment of a number of parameters: scientific (theoretical, methodological or conceptual) level of the article; relevance of the problem raised in the article, scientific novelty and originality of the material; scientific and practical significance of the research; the degree of assistance to development of scientific representations in the relevant field of knowledge; accuracy of the information provided by the author; accuracy and precision of the definitions and wording used (input) by the author; validity of findings; representativeness of practical material involved in the analysis; the degree of the illustrative of tables and figures given by the author; total list and analysis of all identified deficiencies, the statement of the absence of plagiarism, general conclusion about the expediency of the publication of the scientific article or its rejection and refinement.

The review should also include the evaluation of logic, language, and style of presentation, their compliance with the requirements and norms of the literary and scientific language.

The review is signed by an original signature of the reviewer.

**4.4.** According to the results of reviewing the reviewer need to submit one of the following decisions for the consideration of the Editorial Board:

- the article is recommended for publication in the journal (without modifications);
- the article is recommended for publication in the journal after the modifications;
- the article is not recommended for publication.

## Appendix 1

**REVIEW OF ARTICLE SUBMITTED FOR PUBLICATION IN THE  
JOURNAL  
PERM UNIVERSITY HERALD. SERIES "PHILOSOPHY. PSYCHOLOGY.  
SOCIOLOGY"**

The title of the article: \_\_\_\_\_

The article includes \_\_\_\_\_ pages, \_\_\_\_\_ pictures, \_\_\_\_\_ tables, \_\_\_\_\_ references.

**The Journal Subjects:** Philosophy, Psychology, Sociology.

1. The subject of the article (underline the right one; if it is necessary, you may add a comment)	Responding to the Journal / Does not respond to the Journal; it is advisable to submit this article in other Journal, for example, _____
2. Congruence of the content of the article with the declared title (underline the right one)	Fits the title / Fits the title partially / Does not fit the title
3. Topicality of issues raised in the article for the relevant field of knowledge (underline the right one)	Highly relevant / Somewhat relevant / Irrelevant
4. The reviewer's opinion on the absence or presence of plagiarism (If the amount of genuine text is below 75% or borrowing from one source is greater than 7%, the article will	Plagiarism is lacking / Plagiarism is present / Reviewer's comment:

<p>send back for revision. However, there are specific exceptions in the case of some humanitarian studies). Underline the right one; if it is necessary, you may add a comment.</p>	
<p>5. Novelty, originality of the article (underline the right one; if it is necessary, you may add a comment)</p>	<p>The material is original, hasn't been published, contains new data / The material is original to a certain extent, has been partially published, contains some new data / The material is not original, has been fully published, new data are lacking / Reviewer's comment:</p>
<p>6. Theoretical, methodological and conceptual level of the article (underline the right one; if it is necessary, you may add a comment)</p>	<p>High / Middle / Low / Reviewer's comment:</p>
<p>7. Theoretical and practical significance of the research, the degree of assistance to development of appropriate field of knowledge (underline the right one; if it is necessary, you may add a comment)</p>	<p>High / Middle / Low / Reviewer's comment:</p>

<p>8. Accuracy of the information provided by the author (underline the right one; if it is necessary, you may add a comment)</p>	<p>Information is reliable / The accuracy of some information is doubtful / Information isn't reliable / Reviewer's comment:</p>
<p>9. Representativeness of empirical data (where available) – underline the right one; if it is necessary, you may add a comment</p>	<p>The representativeness of the material is sufficient / The representativeness of the material isn't sufficient / Reviewer's comment:</p>
<p>10. Degree of the illustrative of tables and figures given by the author (underline the right one; if it is necessary, you may add a comment)</p>	<p>Sufficient / Insufficient / Reviewer's comment:</p>
<p>11. Accuracy and precision of the definitions and wording used in the article (underline the right one; if it is necessary, you may add a comment)</p>	<p>Accuracy and precision are sufficient / Accuracy and precision are insufficient / Reviewer's comment:</p>
<p>12. Compliance of the text with the requirements and norms of the literary and scientific language (underline the right one; if it is necessary, you may add a comment)</p>	<p>Full compliance / Partial compliance / The text doesn't meet the standards / Reviewer's comment:</p>
<p>13. Validity of conclusions (underline the right</p>	<p>Conclusions are fully justified / Conclusions are partially justified / Conclusions aren't justified / Reviewer's comment:</p>

one; if it is necessary, you may add a comment)	
14. Compliance with the requirements of the Guidelines for English-speaking authors (underline the right one)	Meets the requirements of the Guidelines / Partially meets the requirements of the Guidelines / Doesn't meet the requirements of the Guidelines
15. Advantages and disadvantages of the article	
16. If it is necessary, you can make a suggestion how to correct and/or to complement the article	
17. General conclusion about the expediency of the publication of the scientific article (underline the right one; if it is necessary, you may add a comment)	The article is recommended for publication / The article is recommended for publication after the modifications / The article is not recommended for publication (the main reason)

18. Information about the reviewer:

---



(surname, name, patronymic)

---



---

(work place, position, science degree, academic title)

---



---

(E-mail, phone number)

19. The article was received by reviewer « \_\_\_\_ », \_\_\_\_\_ 20\_\_

20. Reviewer's signature: \_\_\_\_\_

21. RESOLUTION OF EDITOR-IN-CHIEF (underline the right one):

- the article is accepted for publication in the journal;
- the article is accepted for publication in the journal after the modifications;
- the article isn't accepted for publication in the journal.

22. Executive Editor's signature \_\_\_\_\_

« \_\_\_\_ » \_\_\_\_\_ 20\_\_

**Vice-Rector for Scientific Research and Innovations**

**of the PSU, PhD.**

**Andrey L. Vetrov**

**Editor-in-Chief,**

**PhD,**

**Vice-Dean of the Department of Philosophy**

**and Sociology for Scientific Research,**

**Professor**

**Alexander Yu. Vnutskikh**