

## **Regulations on the review of materials received for publication in the Russian scientific journal "Telescope - a journal of sociological and marketing research".**

### **1. General Provisions**

1.1 These Regulations determine the procedure for reviewing copyrighted materials (manuscripts) submitted to the editors of the «Russian scientific journal Telescope - Journal of Sociological and Marketing Research», founded by the Non-Profit Organization "Association for Business Development and Non-Commercial Projects "Holding-Spectrum" (hereinafter referred to as the journal) .

1.2 Reviewing is carried out in order to select the most relevant, original, scientifically novel materials, improve the quality of published articles and ensure a high scientific level of the journal.

1.3 All materials submitted for publication in the journal (scientific articles, reviews, reviews, etc.) that have passed the initial check (see paragraph 2) are subject to review.

1.4 Members of the editorial board and the council of the journal, the editor-in-chief are involved in the review.

1.5 The journal uses double-blind reviewing.

### **2. Primary review of materials in the editorial**

2.1 Author's materials (manuscripts) and accompanying documents (author's questionnaire, conclusion of the academic council of the department / laboratory on the submitted scientific manuscript and external review), prepared in accordance with the requirements established by the editorial board, are sent to the editorial office of the journal.

2.2 Notification of the authors about the receipt of materials is carried out by the editors of the journal within 7 days.

2.3 All materials received for publication in the journal are subject to preliminary verification by the editors for:

a) compliance with the formal requirements for the materials published in the journal: correspondence of the article to the subject (profile) of the journal, acceptable length; availability of UDC, metadata (title, information about the author, abstract, keywords) in Russian and English; the correctness of the design of the text part, bibliographic apparatus, tables, formulas, figures; the quality of the visual material;

b) the completeness and correctness of the execution of the submitted documents, including those containing information about the author (authors), expressing the will of all co-authors to publish the material in the journal and the transfer of the right of the editorial board of the journal to place the article on the Internet information and telecommunication network.

2.4 A preliminary check is carried out by the editorial office of the journal within a period not exceeding 14 days from the date of receipt of materials by the editorial office. The results of the preliminary check of the materials are brought to the attention of the authors by e-mail.

2.5 Based on the results of the preliminary check, the article may be accepted for consideration (with subsequent scientific review) or rejected as not meeting the formal requirements.

2.6 In case of rejection of the submitted material, the author is sent a notification with a proposal to eliminate the discrepancies found during the initial check and resubmit the materials to the editorial office by a certain date (set in agreement with the chief (responsible) editor, taking into account the schedule for preparing and issuing issues).

2.7 All materials that have passed the initial check are registered in the register of materials received by the editorial office, indicating the date of submission of the manuscript, its title, full name. and places of work of the author (authors), after which they are sent for review.

### **3. Scientific review of materials**

3.1 Registered manuscripts accepted for consideration based on the results of the initial check are sent by e-mail by the editors of the journal to reviewers whose candidacies are agreed with the chief (responsible) editor of the journal. In this case, the reviewer is additionally notified about the submission of materials.

3.2 Together with the manuscript, the reviewer receives a cover letter, which states the request of the chief (responsible) editor of the journal to review the material using a standard questionnaire (form) or in free form, contains information on the terms and conditions of scientific review.

3.3 The reviewer is recommended to use the review form specially developed by the editorial board (Appendix 1), which must be completed. If there are comments or a negative assessment on any item, an explanation is required in the corresponding column "Comments".

3.4 The review can also be prepared in free form with the obligatory coverage of the following provisions:

- title of the manuscript, full name authors (if they are known to the reviewer);
- correspondence of the article to the subject of the journal;

- clarity, clarity of the formulation of a scientific problem;
- relevance, originality and scientific (practical) significance of the research;
- theoretical and methodological base of the research;
- reliability of information used by the author;
- validity of the conclusions drawn;
- completeness, representativeness and correctness of the design of the bibliographic list;
- logic of presentation;
- language and style;
- correctness in the use of terms;
- appropriateness and correctness of drawings, tables and formulas;
- clarity, information content of the title of the article;
- the correct choice of keywords;
- the quality of the abstract (completeness and conciseness of the reflection of the content of the material).

All comments made by the reviewer should be specified, and negative assessments should be substantiated.

Based on the results of the review, the expert in the final part of the review should draw one of the following conclusions:

- a) the article is recommended for publication in the journal without revision;
- b) the article is recommended for publication in the journal, subject to revision (without re-reviewing);
- c) the article is recommended for publication in the journal, subject to revision and re-review;
- d) the article is not recommended for publication in the journal.

3.5 The text of the review is followed by the signature of the reviewer and its transcript (last name, first name, patronymic in full) with the obligatory indication of the scientific degree, place of work and position, e-mail address. Prepared reviews are received by the editors of the journal in one of the following ways:

- a) are transferred directly to the executive secretary of the editorial office or the chief (responsible) editor of the journal,
- b) sent by mail
- c) sent by e-mail in the form of a scan.

3.6 Reviewing is carried out in compliance with the principles of scientific ethics.

3.7 The review period is set in agreement with the reviewer, but should not exceed 1 month from the date of receipt of the materials.

3.8 Reviewing the materials submitted to the editors of the journal is carried out with confidentiality. Information about the reviewers (full name, place of work, etc.) is not reported to the authors of the manuscripts. Reviewers are notified of the confidential nature of the review in a cover letter.

3.9 Reviews are kept in the editorial office of the journal for 5 years from the date of publication of the material or the decision to reject the manuscript.

#### **4. Deciding on the publication of materials**

4.1 After receiving reviews at the next meeting of the editorial board, the issue of the advisability of publishing manuscripts is considered. The decision of the editorial board is taken by a simple majority of votes and recorded in the minutes of the meeting. In case of equality of votes, the vote of the editor-in-chief is decisive.

4.2 The decision taken by the editorial board to publish (with revision / without revision) or to reject the manuscript is brought to the attention of the author by e-mail within 3 working days after the meeting of the editorial board.

4.3 If a positive decision is made, the editors of the journal inform the author about the admission of the material without revision for publication, indicating the issue (number) of the journal.

4.4 If a decision is made on the need to improve the article, a copy of the review is sent to the author by e-mail (without specifying information about the reviewer) and a deadline is set (no more than 2 months) during which changes should be made to the text of the article and resubmitted to the editors of the journal. If the revised manuscript is returned in violation of the deadline, the editorial board reserves the right to shift the terms of its consideration and publication in the journal.

4.5 The manuscript sent by the author to the editorial office after revision can be transferred by decision of the editorial board for a second peer review to the same reviewer or another specialist. No more than two revisions of the material submitted for publication are allowed, after which the decision of the editorial board on the advisability of publishing this manuscript is considered final and brought to the attention of the author.

4.6 If a decision is made to reject the manuscript based on a negative review, the author is sent a copy of the review by e-mail (without specifying information about the reviewer) and indicates the deadline (no more than 1 month)

during which he has the right to protest the opinion of the reviewer by sending to the editors of the journal a reasoned request for re-reviewing the material. In this case, the editorial board considers this article again and decides on the advisability of re-reviewing. The specialist performing the additional review of the material is not informed about the results of the previous review. In case of repeated negative review, the manuscript is rejected and not subject to further consideration. This decision is considered final and the authors are notified about it.

Editor-in-Chief \_\_\_\_\_ V.K. Potemkin