

Reviewing Articles

Bulletin of Krasnoyarsk State Pedagogical University named after V.P. Astafiev is a peer-reviewed scientific publication.

The manuscripts received for consideration are sent for peer review to assess their scientific content to several experts in the appropriate field.

The editorial board adopted the international standards of one-sided blind and two-way blind peer review. For the objectivity of the results of the review, the names of the reviewers are not disclosed to authors or other reviewers (except the cases when the reviewers themselves ask to indicate their name). The International Ethics Committees recommended that reviewers remain anonymous for the duration of the review and after.

1. Reviewing stages.

1. Expertise of the scientific level of the article is carried out by the editorial board and the responsible editor in accordance with the scientific specialization of the article presented (open review).

2. Scientific review of the article, its correspondence to the subject of the journal, the requirements for registration, an assessment of the completeness of the submitted review, is carried out by the editorial board of the journal, the editor-in-chief (one-sided blind review).

3. The manuscript of the article is sent for peer review to one (several) of the members of the editorial board or to invited experts in a scientific field closest to the subject of the article (two-way blind peer review).

2. Review dates

1. *Beginning of the review.* The beginning for the calculation of the review period is the assignment of the status "*Adopted for review*" to the registered article.

2. *Review process.* The manuscripts received for consideration are sent for peer review to assess their scientific content to several experts in the appropriate field. The general term in accordance with international practice and the recommendations of international ethical committees is 1 month starting from the date of transfer of the manuscript of the article for the review.

3. *Repeated review.* If there is a decision "*Recommended, in view of the correction of the noted shortcomings*" in the received recommendations of the reviewers of the journal, then the author is sent recommendations and issues for correction. The manuscript of the article, corrected by the author, is re-directed to the review.

4. *Acceptance for publication.* The decision to accept for publication is based on the generally accepted positive recommendations of the reviewers of the journal (at the same time the status "Adopted for publication" is assigned).

5. *Refusal to publish.* If in the received recommendations of the reviewers of the journal the decision "Not recommended for publication" is made, then the author of the manuscript is sent a reasoned refusal to publish. Manuscripts of articles not recommended for publication *are not reviewed again.*

3. *Criteria for assessing the quality of the content of an article*

- relevance (of interest to scientists and readers of the journal);
- novelty of the content of the article, author's contribution;
- compliance of the article with modern achievements in the relevant scientific field;
- compliance with modern requirements of the methodology of the relevant branch of science;
- compliance of the content of the article with the topic stated in the title;
- compliance with the structure of the research article;
- validity of the author's provisions and conclusions;
- scientific language, style, appropriateness of using tables, diagrams, figures and formulas;
- completeness of the reference list of sources cited in the article.