

«Approved»

Chief Editor of the Scientific Journal
“Vestnik Permskogo Universiteta. Seriya
“Ekonomika”
 (“Perm University Herald. ECONOMY”)
T.V. Mirolyubova

**Regulations
on policies and practices of peer reviewing manuscripts
submitted to the journal “Vestnik Permskogo Universiteta. Seriya “Ekonomika”
 (“Perm University Herald. ECONOMY”) for publication**

1. GENERAL PROVISIONS

1.1. These Regulations regulate the procedure of peer reviewing manuscripts submitted to the scientific journal “Vestnik Permskogo Universiteta. Seriya “Ekonomika” (“Perm University Herald. ECONOMY”) (hereafter referred to as Journal) and set requirements for peer reviews of these manuscripts.

1.2. Peer review (expert evaluation) of scientific manuscripts is performed with the purpose of selecting the most significant and relevant (having good prospects) scientific works, providing high scientific level of the Journal on the whole, as well as in order to foster currently important research via evaluation of manuscripts by high-level experts.

1.3. All materials submitted to the Journal for publication are subject to peer review.

2. RULES OF SUBMISSION OF MATERIALS FOR PEER REVIEW

2.1. Only the manuscripts prepared and formatted in strict accordance with the terms and procedures for submitting manuscripts can be peer reviewed.

2.2. Content of a manuscript must be suitable for open access publication. If there is a restricting stamp, it serves as a ground for rejecting the material.

2.3. Providing all the requirements are satisfied, the editors accept the manuscript. Chief Editor or Deputy Chief Editor sends it for peer reviewing.

3. PROCEDURE FOR PEER REVIEWING

3.1. All scientific articles submitted to the Journal are subject to mandatory peer review in order to provide their expert evaluation.

3.2. Chief Editor or Deputy Chief Editor of the Journal determines whether the manuscript fits the Journal’s specialization and sends it for peer reviewing.

3.3. The Journal uses double-blind peer-review system (authors and reviewers are not aware of each other’s identities). At least two reviewers are assigned for each manuscript.

3.4. The scientists involved in the peer-review process are those being acknowledged specialists in the field under consideration and having had not less than three publications on the subject

discussed in the article under review over the last three years. A reviewer must have a scientific degree of the Doctor or Candidate of Sciences.

3.5. Reviewers must follow “Regulations on ethical standards of editorial policy of Perm State University” accepted in the university.

3.6. A reviewer must consider the article sent to him/her in due time and send the editors a review prepared in compliance with the requirements or a motivated refusal to perform the review.

3.7. A term of peer reviewing is set in each individual case provided that all conditions favourable for preparing the review as promptly as possible are created and the process takes not more than 15 days of the moment when the application for publication was received by the editors. The term can be prolonged in the event that additional peer reviewing is necessary or a reviewer specializing in the given field is temporarily absent.

3.8. All manuscripts are inspected by means of “Antiplagiat” (Anti-plagiarism) system in order to detect unoriginal text. If text originality is less than 75%, the manuscript is returned to the author as requiring improvement, supplied with substantiation (borrowings from one source are allowed to be of not more than 7%, except they are borrowings from publications of the author of the article that describe scientific results which have been previously obtained and published elsewhere. In this case references to the previously published materials are necessary). Borrowings from Internet-sites with student works are not allowed.

3.9. Based on the reviews and recommendations obtained, Chief Editor (Deputy Chief Editor) makes a decision from among following possibilities:

3.9.1. In the case of positive conclusions and positive recommendations of all reviewers, the article is approved for publication in one of the Journal’s issues.

3.9.2. In the event there are differences of opinion among reviewers, Chief Editor or Deputy Chief Editor sends the manuscript for additional reviewing.

3.9.3. In the event that reviews or recommendations contain essential criticisms and conclude that the article requires revision and improvement, the manuscript is sent back to the author for addressing the criticisms. The improved variant of the manuscript again undergoes peer review, with the same reviewer or another one, assigned at the editors’ discretion. If this time the result is negative again, the manuscript is rejected and is not subject to further consideration.

3.9.4. In the event that all reviewers draw negative conclusions, the author is sent a refusal letter, in which rejection of publishing his/her manuscript in the Journal is reasoned.

3.10. The author of the manuscript is informed of the peer review results. The editors send authors of the submitted materials copies of reviews and conclusion about the results of peer reviewing.

3.11. Originals of peer reviews are kept in the editorial office of the Journal for 5 years. If requested by the Ministry of Education and Science of the Russian Federation, they are obligatorily furnished to the Supreme Attestation Commission and/or Ministry of Education and Science.

4. REQUIREMENTS FOR PEER REVIEWS

4.1. The editors recommend that a standard form of peer review should be used (Annex 1).

4.2. With the concurrence of Chief Editor or Deputy Chief Editor, it is possible to prepare a review in free form.

4.3. A review should contain competent analysis of the content of the article, its impartial and well-reasoned evaluation and well-grounded recommendations. The following points are covered in a review: whether the manuscript fits the Journal's specialization; correspondence between the title and content of the article; compliance of the article with the rules of preparing and formatting manuscripts; relevance of the materials presented; assessment of the content and structure of the manuscript; scientific novelty (new theoretical and methodological approaches, new facts, hypotheses, new research results); to what extent practical issues are covered, their current significance; theoretical and practical significance of the research; to what extent the author's claims and conclusions correspond to current scientific concepts in the given field; reliability of the information presented; correctness and accuracy of the definitions and wordings used (introduced) by the author; validity of the conclusions drawn; the way the article is written (the language and style of the article; the text should be logically coherent; all parts (paragraphs) of the article should have a strong logical connection with each other); whether the list of references contain sufficient number of sources; formatting and design of the text and figures; whether the concepts introduced in the article and expressed in terms are defined in a correct and logically clear way. A review should provide well-reasoned presentation of strengths and weaknesses of the work and state what improvements and modifications should be made by the author.

The review is signed with the reviewer's original signature and certified in the personnel department at the reviewer's primary place of employment.

4.4. Based on the results of peer reviewing, a reviewer presents one of the following decisions for consideration of the editorial board:

- article is recommended for publication (without improvement);
- article is recommended for publication providing that it is revised and improved (without additional peer reviewing);
- article requires improving and additional peer reviewing;
- article is not recommended for publication.

REVIEW

of the manuscript_____

1. Relevance to the Journal's specialization

Choose the appropriate section or state that there is lack of relevance

Economic Theory	
Economic-mathematical Modeling	
Regional and Municipal Economy	
Business Economics and Administration	
Current Issues of Accounting, Auditing and Economic Analysis	

2. Assessment of the scientific level of the work**2.1. Current significance of the problem under consideration (maximum 3 points)**

Is of great significance for solving a certain scientific/practical problem	
Some elements of the manuscript can be used for solving current problems	
Is of no significance	

2.2. Novelty, originality of methods and/or results (maximum 8 points)

State the novel features of the scientific problem dealt with by the author.

2.3. Correctness of the content of the work and conclusions drawn (maximum 5 points)

State how correct and impartial the content and conclusions are, to what extent they correspond to current scientific conceptions in the given field

2.4. Theoretical and practical significance of the manuscript (maximum 5 points)

State theoretical and practical significance of the given manuscript.

State what kind of readership the article will be interesting for, assess prospects of its use and quoting after publication.

2.5. References to sources (maximum 2 points)

Excellent survey of literature is provided (the number of sources on the list is more than 25) 2 points
Survey of literature is sufficient (the number of sources on the list meets the Journal's requirements: 15-25 sources) 1 point
Survey of literature is not sufficient (the number of sources on the list is less than 15) 0 points
There are no references to sources (0 points)

State which part of the article requires further revision and elaboration. State works that have influenced the results of the research but are not stated by the author, if there are any.

3. General description of the work

3.1. Logic and style (maximum 2 points)

The work has well-defined structure and is easy to read (1-2 points)
The work does not have proper structure and is difficult to understand (0 points)
The work is not structured and unreadable (0 points)

3.2. Formatting and design of the work in accordance with the Journal's requirements

Meet all the requirements
There are some minor flaws
Do not meet requirements

State the flaws in formatting.

3.3. Additional comments on the manuscript

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.

4. Conclusion about publication of the manuscript

Criteria for evaluation of the article	Maximum number of points	The reviewer's evaluation
Current significance of the problem under consideration		
Novelty, originality of methods and/or results		
Correctness of the content of the work and conclusions drawn		
Theoretical and practical significance of the manuscript		
References to sources		
Logic and style		
TOTAL		

Note: Evaluation scale (points)

Does not meet requirements of the Journal and does not fit its scientific level 0-10

Essential revision of the content and additional peer reviewing are required 11-17

The manuscript may be published after the criticisms are addressed 18-20

The work meets all the Journal's requirements and can be published unconditionally 21-25

I have read and understood "Regulations on ethical standards of editorial policy of Perm State University"

Date

Reviewer