

GUIDELINES FOR REVIEWERS ON REVIEWING MANUSCRIPTS SUBMITTED TO THE JOURNALS OF "SPACE AND TIME" PUBLISHING PROJECT

The journals of "Space and Time" Publishing Project have the policy to oblige the peer review of all the manuscripts submitted for publication.

1. General Provisions

1.1. **The scientific peer reviewing** (hereinafter ‘the reviewing’) is a procedure to review the scientific papers by specialists in relevant fields of science. **The peer review** (hereinafter ‘the Review’) is a brief analysis of scientific manuscript; it serves as the main basis for the Editorial Board to make decision on whether to publish any submitted manuscript.

1.2. The content of the received paper for peer-review should correspond to the topics and the scientific level of the "Space and Time" Publishing Project journals. It should be of undoubted scientific interest and value, written in proper way semantically and grammatically, in accordance with the norms of the Russian/English literary language, and taken the technical requirements of the "Space and Time" Publishing Project journals into account.

1.3. The purposes to review the manuscript prior to its publication are as follows:

1.3.1. to ascertain the quality of the scientific manuscripts and materials submitted to the Editorial Board, in their compliance with the scientific requirements and article submission standards adopted in the “Space and Time” Publishing Project journals;

1.3.2. if necessary, force the Author to follow such requirements and standards in order to improve the scientific and culture level of the manuscripts submitted to the Editorial Board.

2. Requirements for the Reviewer and Reviewer’s Rights

2.1. The Reviewer should:

2.1.1. be aware of the latest achievements in the scientific field in which he/she makes the Review of the submitted manuscripts, as well as in related disciplines;

2.1.2. know the requirements, terms and conditions for materials submitted to the “Space and Time” Publishing Project journals;

2.1.3. comply with the ethical requirements adopted in the “Space and Time” Publishing Project journals.

2.2. The Reviewers have the right:

2.2.1. to refuse reasonably to review manuscripts and materials sent to them,

2.2.2. to discuss with the Editor in Chief and other Editorial Board members the manuscript and find ways to improve the quality of reviewing it,

2.2.3. to subedit reviewing manuscripts.

3. Structure and Content of the Review

3.1. The Review should include:

- 3.1.1. the title of the manuscript under review;
- 3.1.2. full name of the Author / co-Authors;
- 3.1.3. relevance of research;
- 3.1.4. metadata appropriateness (author(s) credentials; Russian and English annotations, Russian and English keywords; quotes; citation attributions and links; references and bibliography)
- 3.1.5. appropriateness of the scientific, technical and other special terms used in the peer-reviewed manuscript;
- 3.1.6. the novelty of the results, their authenticity and originality;
- 3.1.7. any problems with submitted manuscript;
- 3.1.8. the theoretical or practical importance of the submitted work;
- 3.1.9. recommendation on whether to publishing or not publish the article in the “Space and Time” Publishing Project journals. In case of positive response, Reviewer indicates the journal section where, in his/her opinion, the paper should be included in.

3.2. The Reviewer can also mention:

- 3.2.1. quality of the literature review carried out by the Author(s);
- 3.2.2. usage and well-posedness of scientific methods and academic argumentation basis in the reviewed work;
- 3.2.3. quality of how the Author solves the problem posed in his study;
- 3.2.4. presence or absence of the conclusions and discoveries “prima facie” in the manuscript;
- 3.2.4. Author’s scientific merits;
- 3.2.5. language and style of the manuscript under review;
- 3.2.6. manuscript compliance with requirements and conditions to submit the manuscript and materials received by the "Space and Time" Publishing Project journals;
- 3.2.7. overall impression of the presented materials.

All these points are not compulsory, but optional for Reviewer.

4. Other Requirements for Reviewers and Reviews

4.1. All the Reviews without any exceptions are carried out on a volunteer (non-commercial) basis.

4.2. All Reviewer’s conclusions should be justified in the Review.

4.3. During the reviewing, Reviewer should remember that in the decision on the feasibility of publishing submitted manuscripts, the Review is not meant to become the self-expression of the Reviewer, but purely a utilitarian document that Editorial Board uses for the best papers selection purposes.

4.3.1. While reviewing and critiquing the scientific work, the Reviewer is obliged to avoid insulting the Author of the manuscript under review.

4.3.2. Reviewers should disassociate the Author from his manuscript, and are obliged not to transfer their negative impression of the manuscript under review to the Author.

4.4. Reviewers do not enter into correspondence with Authors.

4.5. Whether it is the negative Review, it should include the detailed explanation and the recommendation not to publish the peer-reviewed material in the "Space and Time" Publishing Project journals.

4.6. Whether it is the positive Review or Reviewer's opinion on the possibility of publishing the manuscript after processing (revising), Reviewer can write Review in free form, or represents it in the form of a completed questionnaire.

4.7. Reviewer uses professional terminology in the Review, which is necessary and therefore is welcomed. The style of the Review should be semantically and grammatically proper one, precise, unambiguous and concise.

4.8. Reviewers cannot act as such for students, postgraduates and doctoral candidates, whom they supervise, or for their superiors and subordinates.

5. Review Submission and Keeping

5.1. Reviewer must sign his/her Review. Reviewer's personal signature may be certified at his/her place of work or by the Editor in Chief (Executive Director of the Autonomous Non-profit Organization Scientific Publishing Centre "SPACE AND TIME").

5.2. The Review can be presented to the Editor in Chief and/or to the Journal Director in person, or be e-mailed to them either in *.doc (*.docx, *.rtf), *.pdf, or scanned in JPEG.

5.3. Editor in Chief keeps all Reviews for three years from the date of manuscript publication (in case of a positive review) or from the Review receipt date (in case of negative reviews).