

РОССИЙСКАЯ ФЕДЕРАЦИЯ
«ЭПОМЕН»

ОБЩЕСТВО С ОГРАНИЧЕННОЙ ОТВЕТСТВЕННОСТЬЮ

350073, Краснодарский край, город Краснодар, поселок Краснодарский, проезд Апшеронский 2-й, дом 11, корпус А

Утверждаю
Главный редактор СМИ
«Эпомен»
01.09.2021
Усенко С. В.

THE PROCEDURE
for reviewing articles sent for publication in journals of the publishing house
"EPOMEN"

Krasnodar
2021.

1. This Procedure for reviewing manuscripts submitted for publication in journals of the editorial board of the Epomenes mass media (hereinafter referred to as the Editorial Board) determines the procedure for reviewing manuscripts of scientific articles submitted by the authors for publication (hereinafter referred to as the Manuscript).

2. All manuscripts submitted to the Editorial Board are subject to mandatory reviewing. The editors review all manuscripts submitted to the editors, corresponding to the editors' topics, with the aim of their expert assessment.

3. Manuscripts submitted for consideration without taking into account the requirements for manuscript formatting are not accepted for registration.

4. The assistant editor-in-chief determines the compliance of the article with the formatting requirements and sends the Manuscript for review to the editor-in-chief and the editor (s) of the thematic section, who has (they) specialization closest to the content of the Manuscript and has (have) publications on the subject under review for the last three years. Manuscripts.

5. Editors carrying out internal reviewing are notified that the Manuscripts sent to them are the intellectual property of the authors and are not subject to disclosure. The review is carried out confidentially. The editors reserve the right not to provide the author with information to the editor. Editors are prohibited from transferring the Manuscript for review to third parties.

6. If all the requirements are met, the Manuscript is registered in the database, and the author (s) of the Manuscript are notified of the acceptance of the Manuscript for consideration.

7. The editor-in-chief and the editors of the thematic sections agree on the deadline for submitting a review of the manuscript.

8. The review period is determined in each individual case, taking into account the creation of conditions for the most efficient publication of the Manuscript.

9. Peer review is carried out through two-way blind peer review.

10. The evaluation of the Manuscript is carried out objectively. The content of the manuscript should reflect a comprehensive analysis of its scientific and methodological advantages and disadvantages.

11. The editorial office sends copies of reviews or a reasoned refusal to the authors of the submitted materials, and also undertakes to send copies of reviews to the Ministry of Science and Higher Education of the Russian Federation upon receipt of the corresponding request to the editorial office of the publication. A review indicating the author of the review can be provided at the request of expert councils to the Higher Attestation Commission.

12. The content of the Review should cover the following issues:

- compliance of the content of the article with its title;
- assessment of the relevance of the content of the article;
- scientific novelty of the research results considered in the Manuscript;
- assessment of the form of presentation of the material and its availability, the clarity of the material presented;

- the validity and expediency of using illustrated material and tables in the Manuscript;
- what are the advantages and disadvantages, corrections and additions should be made by the author;
- admissibility of the volume of the Manuscript;
- the quality of the study of literary sources;
- the correctness of the bibliographic data;
- the expediency of publishing the article.

13. The final part of the Review based on the analysis of the Manuscript should contain reasonable conclusions about the Manuscript and a clear recommendation about:

- the expediency of its publication in a scientific journal;
- refusal to publish;
- the need to finalize the Manuscript.

14. A positive review is not a sufficient reason for the publication of an article. The final decision on the expediency and timing of publication after reviewing is made by the editor-in-chief, and, if necessary, by the Editorial Board of the Editorial Board.

15. In the event of a negative assessment of the Manuscript, the reviewer justifies his conclusions and points out significant inconsistencies that influenced the decision. Negative reviews are not grounds for rejection of the article. The final decision on publication is made by the editor-in-chief, who has the right to publish the article as a discussion article. At the same time, the readers are not informed about this status of the articles.

16. If the Manuscript does not meet one or several criteria, the reviewer indicates in the review the need to revise the article and makes recommendations to the author to eliminate the comments. The author of the Manuscript must make all the necessary corrections to the final version of the Manuscript no later than 10 (ten) calendar days after receiving the notification by e-mail, and return the corrected text and the cover letter to the reviewer to the Editorial Board.

17. Manuscripts, revised by the author, are re-sent for review to the same editor who made critical comments, or to another editor at the discretion of the editor-in-chief.

18. Manuscripts, the authors of which have not eliminated the constructive remarks of the reviewer or do not reasonably refute them, will not be accepted for publication.

19. If the author disagrees with the comments of the reviewer, he can apply for re-review or withdraw the Manuscript, about which he must notify the editors in writing and receive confirmation of the removal of the Manuscript from consideration.

20. The editorial board of the journal does not store Manuscripts that have not been accepted for publication.

21. The manuscript can be published by the decision of the Editorial Board of the Editorial Board.

22. The number of peer-reviewed articles and the terms of reviewing specific articles are determined by the editorial board of the journal based on the plans and the need to form new issues of the journal. The editorial board of the journal does not

undertake any obligation to review absolutely all articles submitted to the journal, as well as the timing of their review.

23. Reviews are kept for 5 (five) years.

24. If the publication of the Manuscript entailed a violation of someone's copyright or generally accepted norms of scientific ethics, then the editors of the Journal have the right to publish a refutation, as well as inform interested parties about the fact of violation of rights.

Editor-in-Chief of the Epomen Publishing House



/ Usenko S.V./