**PROCEDURE FOR REVIEW OF SCIENTIFIC ARTICLES**

**SUBMITTED TO THE**

**«VESTNIK ROSZDRAVNADZORA» JOURNAL**

1. Scientific manuscripts and articles submitted to the «Vestnik Roszdravnadzorа» Journal are subject to mandatory review. Manuscripts shall be sent in accordance with the subject of the scientific research for review by the members of the editorial board or experts. The exceptions are the articles submitted by academicians and corresponding members of the Russian Academy of Sciences.

2. Professionals working in the same research institution where the work was prepared are not engaged in reviewing.

3. Reviewing is confidential, i.e. authors do not know the reviewer's name (except in cases where the reviewer is asking for establishing contact with the author or if the reviewer declares unreliability or falsification of materials contained in the article). The author has the opportunity to review the text of the review.

4. If there is an indication to the necessity to correct the article in its review, the article should be sent back for revision. Articles revised by the author in accordance with the reviewer's comments should be sent for re-review.

5. In case of rejection of the article published in the journal the author will receive a reasoned refusal in written (electronic) form and the text of the review.

6. In case of disagreement with the opinion of the reviewer the author has the right to provide a reasoned response to the journal. The article can be re-directed for review or discussion in the editorial board. The final decision on whether the publication is taken after reviewing is taken by the chief editor of the journal.

7. Copies of reviews should be sent to article authors. The originals should be stored in the journal for five years from the date of publication of articles and inquiries are provided in the expert councils of the Higher Attestation Commission.

**Requirements to the contents and design reviews**

The goal of the review is to promote a strict selection of author's manuscripts for publication and offer specific recommendations for improvement. The review shall objectively evaluate a scientific article and contain a comprehensive analysis of its scientific and methodological advantages and disadvantages. Review length is determined by the reviewer and its content should contain all the necessary and objective information. The reviewer provides a review of the article for a period of not more than 2 weeks from the date of receipt of the article. The recommended scope of reviews – up to 15 thousand characters (including spaces), from 1 to 1.5 pages of text, by 12 font size.

Review of the submitted article should reflect:

* relevance to the journal subject and the urgency of the topic;
* analysis and justification of the problem statement;
* presence of scientific novelty, theoretical and practical significance of the work;
* assessment of main research results;
* quality of normative legal acts, literature and other sources;
* quality of the manuscript execution.

The complex of these issues is of a general nature. Each item requires an individual approach to the choice of criteria for its evaluation.

In the final part of the review a clear recommendation about its publication in the presented form must be given by results of its analysis or about the necessity of follow-up revision (with constructive comments) or on the inexpediency of publication in this journal.

Review should be signed by the reviewer with specification of his academic degree and title and is certified by the seal of the institution where he works.