



PROVISION

on the procedure for articles manuscripts peer review (expert evaluation) process organization, that are sent to the editorial of collection of scientific works «Socio-Economic Research Bulletin» of Odessa National Economic University

This Provision determines the procedure for reviewing (expert evaluation) of scientific articles, that are received by the editorial of collection of scientific works «Socio-Economic Research Bulletin» (hereinafter – the collection) of Odessa National Economic University (hereinafter – ONEU). The legal basis for the development of this Provision is an order of rector of ONEU «On the publication of collections of scientific works «Socio-Economic Research Bulletin», No. 38 of 27.02.1998; Laws and regulations of Ukraine: Civil Code of Ukraine, No. 435-IV of 16.01.2003; The Law of Ukraine «On Publishing activity», No. 318/97-VR of 05.06.1997; The Law of Ukraine «On Printed Mass Media (Press) in Ukraine», No. 2782 of 16.11.1992; The Law of Ukraine «On Copyright and Related Rights», No. 3792-XII of 23.12.1993 and international standards of publication ethics (The Committee on Publication Ethics – COPE).

The Provision regulates the legal relationship between the publisher of the collection of scientific works «Socio-Economic Research Bulletin», its editorial board (experts) and authors in the reviewing (expert evaluation) process of articles manuscripts, that come to the publisher.

I. General part

1.1. Scientific articles, which have been received to the collection editorial, go through a double-blind peer review procedure while maintaining the anonymity of the author and reviewer.

1.2. The scientific article (hereinafter – the article) is taken into consideration, provided that it meets requirements as to original author's articles (hereinafter – manuscripts), which placed on the official website of the collection.

1.3. The author of article is responsible for the reliability and accuracy of facts, quotations, proper names, correctness and completeness of the presentation of bibliographic data, no plagiarism.

1.4. The work with a manuscript, which was accepted for publication after peer review (expert evaluation), is carried out by the editorial according to the technological process of the current collection issue preparation.

II. The procedure for articles manuscripts peer review (expert evaluation) process organizing

2.1. Reviewing (expert evaluation) of articles is carried out by the editorial board, which was approved by the publisher and, if necessary, taking into account the relevant industry specificity of the submitted manuscripts, the editor-in-chief may involve external experts, who hold management positions, have a scientific degree and / or professional experience of at least 5 years. The editorial board includes experts, subject to their formal written consent, which they submit or send by e-mail to the editorial board.

2.2. The scientific article may be accepted for publication only if there is a review (based on the expert evaluation), the receipt of which is provided by the publisher.

2.3. For peer review of articles manuscripts, that are received for publication, are enlisted the experts in the economy (or economic sciences) with degree of Doctor of Economics, which

during the past five years had publications in international and Ukrainian cited editions on economic problems, that correspond to the collection subject areas.

2.4. The editor-in-chief (deputy editor-in-chief or responsible editor) after article receiving, determines its relevance to the collection subject areas, typographic requirements, checks for the plagiarism absence and sends for peer review (expert evaluation) to the editorial board member with scientific specialization, which corresponds to the topic of article. In case of article inconsistency with the collection subject areas and plagiarism detection, the author is informed about the impossibility of its publication, stating the reason.

2.5. In the review on the corresponding article manuscript the reviewer (expert) should determine: the title of article; article's relevance and its conformity to the collection subject areas; structure (presence of all sections) and sequence (logic) of the article material presentation; problem statement; scientific level, originality and novelty of the research results, which submitted for publication; a summary of the main research results; scientific research methods using; use of authoritative literary sources that are indexed in recognized scientometric databases; theoretical and practical importance of work; the reliability and validity of conclusions; comments and specific recommendations for revising, reducing or extending of the article manuscript; conclusions on the possibility of publishing a peer-reviewed article in the ONEU collection of scientific works "Socio-economic research Bulletin of" or its rejection.

The review (expert opinion) form is given in Appendix 1 to this Provision.

2.6. The originals of the reviews should only have of the reviewer signature and reviewing date, which envisage preserves the reviewer anonymity.

2.7. The peer review (expert evaluation) results in paper or scanned electronic form are submitted to the editorial of the collection within the set time limits. Peer review (expert evaluation) periods in each individual case are determined with a creating the conditions for the most expeditious publication of the article and should not exceed 7 days from the date of the manuscript receipt for review.

2.8. The author of article is given an opportunity to read the peer review (expert evaluation) conclusions. The identity of the reviewer (expert) may be disclosed to the author exclusively in cases stipulated by the current legislation on the basis of relevant judicial decision.

2.9. According to the peer review (expert evaluation) results, reviewers (experts) can:

- recommend the article for publication (if the number of points is more than 80);
- recommend the article for publication after its revision based on the comments (if the number of points is 60–80);
- reject the article (if the number of points is less than 60). If the reviewer (expert) rejects the article, than the reasons for such decision should be given in his conclusions.

2.10. If according the reviewer (an expert) conclusions the manuscript needs additions and refinements, the editorial sends such article by e-mail for author's correcting. Corrected article must be returned to the editorial within a period not exceeding 7 days after receiving a peer review results from the editorial.

2.11. The manuscript of article, which is received after revision, together with the author's reply is sent to the reviewer (expert) for reading and supplementary evaluation. The reviewer (expert) must submit to the editorial the repeated results of peer review, at the time set by the editor in chief or executive editor, and editorial board decides on accepting the articles for publication or its rejecting.

2.12. If there is a substantial share of expert's critical remark on the article and a general positive recommendation, the editorial board can refer the material to polemical one and print it for scientific discussion.

2.13. When receiving by the editorial of collection a positive (or negative) reviews (expert opinions) about an article, one of the members of the editorial board and / or the deputy editor-in-chief becomes acquainted with them, and then he presents this article together with the expert opinions at its meeting.

2.14. The final decision about expediency of article publishing after peer review (expert

evaluation) is made by the editor-in-chief, and, where necessary and the existence of conflicting conclusions – collegially, i.e. by the editorial board. The opinion of editorial board of the collection about possibility of the article publishing or its rejection can be made in writing at the end of the review.

2.15. The editorial board of the collection, based on a decision made by the editorial board, sends a letter to the author (s) by email that provides a general evaluation of the article and the and informed about an accepted decision. When rejecting an article with a collegial decision of the editorial board, the editorial sends to the authors a message: «Your article was rejected by the editorial board decision» with a brief justification.

2.16. If the author of article disagrees with the reviewers (experts) opinion, he has a right to submit a reasoned answer to the editorial of the collection and to contact the editor-in-chief, who can send the article for additional agreement to the editorial board.

2.17. Minor corrections to the spelling or stylistic nature are made by the editorial staff without the author's agreement.

2.18. The original of reviews, which certified by the reviewers (experts) signatures, is kept by editorial for three years.

III. Final part

3.1. The provision shall enter into force upon signature and are valid during the whole period of preparation and publication of the Collection of scientific works «Socio-Economic Research Bulletin».

3.2. The necessary editorial changes and amendments to this Regulation may be formulated as a new document or as an appendix to existing document and must be approved at the editorial board meeting.

PEER REVIEW (EXPERT) FORM
for article evaluation to the collection of scientific works
«Socio-Economic Research Bulletin»

Title of article: _____

№	Criteria for evaluation	Points (0-100)
1.	The article's purpose determining (up to 5 points)	
2.	Actuality of research topic and its relevance to the collection subject area (up to 5 points)	
3.	The problem formulation (up to 5 points)	
4.	Structuring (presence of all sections) and sequence (logic) of article material presentation (up to 10 points)	
5.	Scientific level, originality and novelty of research results (up to 25 points)	
6.	Using of the scientific research methods (up to 15 points)	
7.	Theoretical and practical importance of the article, author's personal contribution to solving the problem under consideration (up to 20 points)	
8.	Reliability and validity of conclusions (up to 10 points)	
9.	Literary sources using (relevance of research problem, authority and availability of these works in prestigious international scientometric databases) – up to 5 points	
The average number of points		

On the basis of the article peer review is recommended:

- to accept the article for publication (the average number of points more than 80).
 to accept the article for publication after revision based on the comments (the average number of points is 60–80).
 to reject the article (the average number of points less than 60).

Recommendations and comments to the article: _____

Reviewer (expert) _____ (signature)

« ____ » _____ 20__

The final conclusion of the Editorial Board:

- to accept the article for publication.
- to reject the article (reason: inconsistency of the collection subject area, lack of scientific theoretical and practical results, availability of plagiarism, etc.).

Editor in Chief

M.I. Zvieriakov