**ARTICLE REVIEW PROCEDURE**

1. To comply with the ethical standards accepted by the international scientific community and to prevent any violation of these standards in the work of the editorial board and in the relations with all participants in the process of scientific publications, a mandatory procedure of reviewing the articles, received by the editorial board is carried out.
2. The editorial board checks manuscripts for plagiarism and incorrect information using the appropriate software and has the right to refuse to publish articles prepared by unscrupulous authors.
3. Scientific articles received by the editorial board are considered at the meeting of the editorial board for compliance with the editorial policy and the theme of the journal as well as the scientific profile. The number of reviewers - experts on the subject of the article is determined.
4. Articles conforming to the editorial policy are sent for double-blind review (the reviewer and the author of the article have no information about each other). The editorial board ensures the confidentiality of the authors' material and does not inform anyone about the status of the material in the journal, except the authors. The editorial board also maintains the confidentiality of the reviewers' personal data.
5. Reviewing is carried out by external reviewers and members of the editorial board - leading experts on the profile and problems of the article.
6. The reviewer evaluates:
* Compliance of the topic of the article with the editorial policy of the journal;
* Quality of the abstract (reflection of the main elements of the article in it: relevance, purpose, methods, research results, intended readers interested in the material);
* Problem, purpose, objectives. Lucidity of the hypothesis and formulation of the research objectives;
* Relevance of the subject;
* Novelty and originality of the research;
* Methodology and research methods;
* Rationale, persuasiveness and argumentativeness of the research / conclusions, quality of the problem analysis, logic of the material presentation, indicating the research context, informative literature review, preceding the author's study of the problem;
* Author’s knowledge of scientific literature on the discussed range of problems, including international experience, as well as representativeness of the reference framework of the article;
* Practical application of the research results. The presence of the research perspective;
* Illustrative purposes of the article: sufficiency of iconic material, correspondence of the tables and figures’ contents to the information presented in the article. Readability of visual material;
* Relevance of scientific material to the audience (whether the structure and organization of the manuscript contributes to the perception of the study by the reader);
* Author’s style and language peculiarity (lucidity, simplicity, logical presentation, need for additional scientific and literary editing);
1. The review should contain specific conclusions:
* expediency of the publication, taking into account the existing researches on the stated issue;
* indication of specific shortcomings of the article, what corrections and additions can be made by the author;
* an opinion on the possibility of publication: "accept for publication", "finish off the article", "refuse to publish".
1. The review is executed in an appropriate template and signed by the reviewer.
2. If the reviewers raise questions about the reliability of the data or feasibility of publishing a scientific work, the editorial board provides the author with an opportunity to answer the questions raised.
3. Terms of reviewing - up to two months after receipt of the article.
4. Reviews on the received materials are sent to the authors by e-mail.
5. A positive review is not a sufficient basis for the publication of the article. The editorial board makes the final decision on publication based on the recommendation of several reviewers (in general), as well as guided by the journal policy, taking into account the current legislation in the field of copyright.
6. In case the article is rejected for publication, the editorial board sends a reasoned refusal to the author. An article not recommended for publication by reviewers will not be accepted for reconsideration.
7. After the editorial board makes a decision on the admission of the article for publication, the editorial board informs the author about this and specifies the terms of publication.
8. The original reviews are stored in the editorial office for 5 years.