

## **Rules for reviewing manuscripts submitted for publication in the “Justice” Journal**

### **I. General provisions**

A compulsory review procedure has been established for all materials (articles, literature reviews, events) received by the editorial board.

The objectives of the institute of scientific peer review of materials received by the journal editorial board are assessment and recognition by specialists of the high level of significance of scientific and practical results of research conducted by the authors, compliance of the content and level of research of the topic with the title of the article, novelty of the author’s research, compliance with the ethical standards adopted by the international scientific community and prevention of violations of these standards in relations with all participants in the publication process, introduction of relevant contemporary scientific research into the scientific community.

Upon receipt, the manuscript is registered and undergoes an initial assessment process in terms of compliance with formal and qualitative requirements: journal topics, article design rules, originality, clarity and consistency of presentation in competent Russian language, etc. In case of non-compliance with these requirements, the article is not accepted for review, of which the editorial board notifies the author within 10 days, indicating the reason for rejection.

If the article is accepted for consideration, it is sent for peer review. Experts are qualified specialists on the subject of peer-reviewed materials, who have a Ph.D. or Doctor of Science degree, who have published publications on the subject of the peer-reviewed article over the past three years.

The review process is fulfilled by the members of the journal editorial board and external reviewers with sufficient experience in the scientific field stated in the article, who are familiar with the requirements for materials published in this journal.

The form and length of the review are not strictly regulated: a review, usually 1-2 typewritten pages, should be signed by the reviewer or sent to the editorial board electronically from the reviewer’s email address. As a rule, one review is sufficient for a decision on publication. More than one reviewer is appointed in cases when the article is written at the “junction” of sciences or scientific fields. At the decision of the editor-in-chief, an additional review may be appointed after receiving the initial review.

There is no payment for reviewing articles in the “Justice” journal.

The decision to publish the article is not made by the editorial board on the basis of a review provided by the author himself.

## **II. Review procedure**

In order to achieve the above objectives, the following review procedures have been developed.

In case of internal reviewing, the manuscript shall be sent with a memo to the Rector of the University. The memo contains the title of the manuscript, its author(s), and the time of its receipt by the editorial board. Time allocated for preparing the review is 30 days. Upon the Rector's order, the manuscript shall be submitted to the relevant scientific department of the University for reviewing.

The head of the relevant department assigns the review of the manuscript to a member of the department (holding a scientific degree) specialising in a subject similar or close to the subject developed by the author of the manuscript. The review is discussed at the department meeting. Any employee of the department may give an opinion on the issues studied in the manuscript. The review is registered in the minutes of the department meeting. The abstract from the minutes and the review are submitted to the journal editorial board.

For external review, the manuscript is emailed to a member of the editorial board requesting a review with the deadline set.

### **The reviewer assesses:**

- the relevance of the article to the subject matter and specialisation of the scientific journal, and the relevance of the content of the article to the topic stated in the title;
- topic relevance;
- a scientific problem statement;
- new issues proposed by the author, the scientific novelty of the article;
- the author's knowledge of the scientific literature on the issues discussed, including foreign sources;
- completeness, clarity and correctness of the graphic material presented, and the use of uniform terminology and other features;
- the relevance of the research results presented in the reviewed article to the original statement of the scientific problem, and the validity of the conclusions.

### **The review should contain clear conclusions giving the following:**

- 1) an objective and comprehensive assessment of the contents of the work and the possibility of publishing it in the journal;
- 2) list of errors in methodology (if any);
- 3) clear suggestions on how the text may be improved;
- 4) recommendations:
  - that the article may be published without change;

– that the article may be published, subject to correction by the author (with or without a second peer review);

– on the refusal to publish the article.

The editorial board of the journal sends a copy of the review or a reasoned refusal to the author of the submitted material. An article not recommended by the reviewer for publication is not accepted for re-consideration.

All reviews are kept in the editorial office in writing for five years. The editorial board of the journal sends copies of reviews to the Ministry of Education and Science of the Russian Federation upon receipt of a corresponding request by the editorial office.

A positive review is not a sufficient basis for publishing the article. The final decision on the advisability of publication is made by the editorial board taking into account the review(s) received, as well as the motivated response of the author(s) of the article.

The selection of material for the current issue is determined by the editorial plans in accordance with the publication frequency of the journal issues:

No 1 (March);

No 2 (June);

No 3 (September);

No 4 (December).

The receipt of the review by the editorial board is registered with the mark “positive”, “negative” or “manuscript to be revised”.

Manuscripts that have received a positive review are moved to the “Working Papers” folder to be published in the next issues of the journal.

After the article has been edited by the author, it is resubmitted to the same reviewer to assess whether the comments have been adequately addressed and/or whether the author’s refusal to make any corrections has been justified.

A negative review is communicated to the author of the manuscript by email. The editorial board does not set any deadline for editing or improving the manuscript.

The author of the manuscript will not be informed of the name, title and academic rank of the reviewer.

### **III. The post-review stage**

The author of the article may submit a motivated disagreement with the results of the review. The decision to re-review the article is made by the editor-in-chief or the deputy editor-in-chief.

If the authors agree with the reviewer's comments, they have the right to amend the article and resubmit it. The authors are also advised to submit a written response to the reviewer's comments. In this case the procedure of reviewing is repeated. The date of receipt of the article in the editorial office is the date of its last submission after revision.

With minor comments requiring only editorial corrections and with the consent of the author(s), a decision may be made to accept the article for publication. Information about the publication plan is communicated to the author(s) after consideration of the reviewed articles at the meeting of the editorial board when approving the next issue of the journal.

The final decision on the date of publication of the article is taken during the process of structuring the next issues and is approved by the Chairman of the editorial board or the editor-in-chief.

The editorial board's preparation of a paper for publication consists of supervising the reviewers' comments, literary editing and updating the text to the editorial standards accepted in the journal. The editorial board reserves the right to carry out scientific and literary editing of accepted materials. Changes made to the text must be agreed upon with the author(s).

The views expressed in the articles represent the views of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect those of the editorial board of the journal.

The review process can be lengthy, so authors are advised against submitting articles that need to be published as soon as possible.

Any author has a chance to be published regardless of where they live, their nationality or whether they have an academic degree.

All publications in scientific journal are free of charge. After publication, the author receives a copy of the relevant issue of the journal.