

PROCESS OF REVIEW

Before publication in the journal, all manuscripts are initially considered by the editors to evaluate their compliance with the topics and requirements of the journal. After the editors' decision, the submitted manuscripts are sent to experts working in the relevant field. The manuscript passes a one-sided blind review: the authors do not know the reviewer; reviewers know the authors.

There is a review to ensure that journals publish high-quality research. Changes and improvements to the article are part of the publishing process. Reviewing is a positive process and an integral part of scientific publication, which confirms the high quality of scientific articles. Reviewers who invest time to improve your article are experts on the subject of scientific research outlined in the article.

In the review process, the material of the article should become more reliable. Reviewers may indicate disadvantages in the work that require more detailed explanation or additional research and experiments. The material of the article should become more accessible for perception. If any moments in the work are difficult for readers to perceive, reviewers may ask to correct them. Reviewers consider research on relevance within their subject area. Another aspect of the existence of a review policy in magazines: the editorial should be sure that publishes only qualitative materials in their publication.

Common Reasons to Discard Publication

Refusal to publish an article is possible in the following situations:

- the article is incorrectly structured;
- the article is insufficiently qualified in detail to understand the problem statement and analysis proposed by the authors;
- scientific novelty in the article is not sufficiently formulated;
- lack of sufficient number of actual references to literary sources;
- the article contains theories, concepts or conclusions that are not fully supported by the analysis data, the arguments provided by the information;
- the article does not provide a sufficiently detailed description of the methods and materials that would allow other scientists to repeat the theoretical study and experiment;
- the article does not contain clear descriptions or explanations of the hypotheses that were tested, description of experiments, examples of statistical or experimental samples;
- the article does not describe enough the technique of conducting experiments;
- remarks on the quality of the writing language.

Repeated review of the article and the response to the reviewer's remarks

For reconsideration of the article and responses to comments by reviewers, you must:

- pay attention to all comments provided by the editor and reviewers;
- describe all changes in the article in the reverse letter;
- perform additional experiments or analyzes that the reviewer recommends, or provide a detailed justification why this does not need to be done;
- in a return letter describe separately all the points in which you agree with the reviewer and which do not agree;
- provide a polite and scientific justification of the moments you disagree with;
- clearly state all changes in the article you have made;
- return the revised manuscript and the letter back in time set by the editor.

Remember that the reviewer is an expert in your subject area. If the suggestions made by the reviewer are not correct, then this is probably because the reviewer did not understand your work correctly. This means that your work is written hard to perceive, and therefore the reader will not be able to properly understand your research. Thus, you should make the text of the article more clear and understandable to the reader.

The editorial staff does not provide personal data to the reviewer, all communication takes place through the editorial board of the journal.

It's important to be persistent when you try to publish an article. If timely, correctly and scientifically substantiated to respond to the comments of editors and reviewers, you can further achieve the publication of the article.

It's better not to choose another journal until one of the following events has occurred:

- the editor replied that the topics of your work are fundamentally not relevant to the topic of the magazine, the editor refuses your manuscript without the right to re-submit it;
- Your manuscript was refused even after you answered all the corrections and comments by the reviewer;
- You have received a refusal from the reviewer.

Publication is a complex process, so you should be ready to work on your article, responding to comments from both editors and reviewers, and make the necessary corrections to your work.