

REGULATIONS
on the procedures for reviewing manuscripts
submitted to the «Russian Arctic»
scientific information and analytical journal
for publication

Approved by the Editorial Board of
Scientific information and analytical
journal «Russian Arctic»
(Protocol №3 dated 10/15/2018)

Reviewed and approved at editorial board meeting
(Protocol №2 dated 01.10.2018)

1. Reviewing procedure

1.1. The journal covers the main issues and scientific achievements relating to research, exploration and development of the Arctic region. The Journal's subject areas are general biology, physiology, transport, energy and earth science. Manuscripts, previously unpublished and submitted to the Editorial Board for review, must fit the Journal's subject areas and meet publishing standards (see clause 2 of present Regulations).

1.2. Manuscripts are reviewed by the Editorial Board and the Editorial Desk (hereinafter referred to as the Editors), who reserve the right to revise the manuscripts (i.e. internal review). The decision on publication is made by the Editors based on assessment by external reviewers, relevance to the Journal's subject areas and scientific value.

1.3. A decision to publish is based on single-blind peer review. Only the manuscripts recommended by external reviewers are approved for publication.

External reviewers may include members of the Editorial Board as well as high-level scientists and specialists in the relevant area of knowledge (i. e., Doctors of Science and full professors), who are not part of the editorial staff. The Journal's editor-in-chief and scientific editor determine which expert reviews a submitted manuscript.

1.4. The review timeframe is determined with a view to publish the manuscript as quickly as possible. The recommended review period is 7 working days and should not exceed 1 month.

1.5. The Reviewer issues recommendations for revising the manuscript; the Editors forward the feedback to the Author who's expected to revise the manuscript accordingly and resubmit it for consideration. The revised manuscript should be resubmitted within 3 months. In case the Author refuses to revise the manuscript in accordance with the Reviewer's recommendations, the Editors will remove the manuscript from the register.

1.6. Once the Reviewer's feedback is received, the Editor-in-Chief and Scientific Editor will decide whether to publish the manuscript (the whole team of editors may be involved in the decision process if necessary). The Reviews are kept at the editorial office for three years from the date of a manuscript's publication and presented to Russia's Attestation Commission at its request.

1.7. A Manuscript will be rejected in case:

- it fails to meet publishing standards and the Author refuses to correct it accordingly;
- the Author fails to address the issues highlighted by the reviewer by either implementing the suggested changes or presenting valid counterarguments.

1.8. The Editors do not disclose information relating to the manuscript (e.g. about submission, content, review process, Reviewer's feedback and final decision) to anyone other than the Author and Reviewer themselves. The Reviewer is not allowed to copy manuscripts or delegate reviewing to a third person without permission of the Editorial Desk. The Reviewer, as well as the editorial staff, are not allowed to use for their own benefit any knowledge of the content of the manuscript before its publication. The Manuscript is the Author's property and is not subject to disclosure.

1.9. If publication results in a copyright violation or breaks universally accepted norms of scientific ethics, the Editors have the right to withdraw the manuscript.

2. Publishing standards

2.1. Manuscripts submitted to the Editorial Desk must have:

- UDC;
- Article title;
- Abstract;

- Keywords;
- References;
- Author's data, including contact e-mail, university, academic degree, occupation;
- Language and presentation style must be accessible and understandable to a wide audience. We recommend Author adheres to approved terminology;
- Other requirements are available on the journal's webpage.

2.2. Tables, figures and photographs inserted in the body of a manuscript and are sent to the editorial office by email as separate files. Photo resolution of at least 300 dpi is recommended.

2.3. The Author keeps copies of all manuscript materials.

3. Review Content Requirements

3.1 The Reviewer's task is to critically review manuscripts, offer recommendations for revision and approve or reject manuscripts for publication.

3.2. The Review should contain an in-depth analysis of the manuscript, provide constructive feedback and offer detailed recommendations for revision.

3.3. The Review should:

- provide general analysis of the scientific level, terminology, structure, relevance of the topic of the manuscript;
- assess whether the manuscript meets publishing standards and is publication-ready;
- assess scientific level of the manuscript and whether the methods and research used by Author are in line with the latest scientific achievements;
- compare the manuscript to other, previously published, works on the subject: what's new or what's different, whether it plagiarises other authors or from earlier works of the Author (both as a whole or in passages);
- highlight inaccuracies and errors made by the author, if any.

3.4. The Reviewer should make recommendations to the Author and Editors for a manuscript's improvement. The Reviewer's comments and suggestions should be fair and constructive and help improve the manuscript's scientific and methodological levels.

3.5. The Review's conclusion should give a general verdict on the manuscript and produce a clear recommendation on whether the manuscript is fit for publication. If the Reviewer rejects a manuscript, they must verify their conclusions.

3.6. The Review must contain the Reviewer's signature, state the Reviewer's full name, academic degree, title and position and date of Review.

4. Informing the Author of Review Outcome

4.1. After the Reviewer approves a manuscript for publication, the Editors will inform the Author thereof and set an approximate date for publication.

4.2. If the Reviewer rejects a manuscript, the Editors will send a copy of the Review to the Author along with a recommendation to implement the changes suggested by the Reviewer or provide valid arguments against revision. The Author must make all necessary corrections to the manuscript and re-submit the revised version to the Editors. The revised manuscript must be accompanied by an electronic version thereof, the original version and a cover letter containing a response to the Reviewer's comments. A revised manuscript is reviewed again, and the Editors decide on publication. A manuscript sent to the Author for revision must be returned to the Editors no later than 2 (two) weeks after receipt. Returning a manuscript at a later date causes a change of publication date.

4.3. The Review is confidential and is provided to the Author upon request without disclosing any information regarding the Reviewer's identity (e. g. signature, name, occupation).

4.4. In case a manuscript is rejected for publication, the editorial staff provide the Author with justifiable reasons for rejection. The Editors do not keep rejected manuscripts. Manuscripts approved for publication are not returned to the Author. Manuscripts that receive a negative review are not published or returned to the Author.