

Regulations on reviewing scientific articles in the RSHU Proceedings Journal

1. The Article is accepted for consideration only if it complies with requirements of the author's final manuscripts of the articles (papers) posted on the website of Federal State Budgetary Educational Institution of Higher Professional Education "Russian State Hydrometeorological University" (RSHU) (<http://www.rshu.ru/>) in section " RSHU Proceedings Journal ".
2. All materials should be open-accessed. Restrictive facsimile signature serves as a basis for rejection of the paper from open publication.
3. One carefully read and signed by the Author (Coauthors) copy of the Article, information about the Author(-s) (Questionnaire), Letter to the Editorial staff, abstract in Russian and in English, key words in Russian and in English, as well as electronic version of all documents on electronic media or by email (to rio@rshu.ru) should be sent to the Editorial Staff.
4. The Article is registered in the register stating the date of submission, title, names and place of work of the Author(-s). The Article is given a unique registration number. These data are also included in the database.
5. Editor in Chief directs the Article for peer review by a member of the Editorial Board in charge of the appropriate area/scientific discipline. In his absence or when receiving Article from a member of the Editorial Board the Chief Editor directs the Article for reviewing by external reviewers.
6. Each scientific article of students, post-graduates, candidates for a degree of candidate of sciences, persons without scientific degree should have a review by an expert of appropriate scientific field (doctors and professors). Moreover, there should be a recommendation of the Chair for the publication of the Articles of post-graduates and candidates for a degree of candidate of sciences.
7. The reviewer should consider the Article ***within two weeks*** after submission and send a reasoned refusal to review or a review itself to the editorial staff (by e-mail, mail).
8. Editorial staff recommends using a standard form for reviewing. The reviewer may recommend the Article for publication, may recommend for publication after revision with due consideration of the comments or may not recommend it for publication. If reviewer recommends the Article for publication after revision with due consideration of the comments or does not recommend it for publication the review should state the reasons for such decision.
9. Having substantial portion of critical comments by a reviewer at the overall positive recommendations allows to refer the paper to the category of a polemical one and print it in the order of scientific discussion.
10. In evaluating reviews the attention should be paid to relevance of a scientific problem solved by the Author in the paper. The review should clearly describe theoretical or applied significance of the study, relate the authors' conclusions to

existing scientific concepts. Reviewer's evaluation of Author's personal contribution to solution of the problem should be an essential element of the review. It is worth noting in review the compliance of style, logic and presentation accessibility to scientific nature of the paper, as well as a conclusion about reliability and validity of the findings.

11. After receiving reviews, at the next meeting of the Editorial Board, the papers submitted are considered and final decision based on evaluation of review for publication, or refusal to publish the Articles is made. On the basis of the decision made the Author(-s) is/are sent a letter (by e-mail, mail) on behalf of the Editorial staff. The letter provides an overall evaluation of the Article; if the Article may be published after revision/with due consideration of the comments the recommendations for revision/removal of the comments are given; if the Article is not accepted for publication the reasons for such decisions are clarified.

12. The Articles may be submitted for additional or anonymous peer review if there is a sufficient reason for this.

13. The Article sent by the Author to the Editorial staff after complying with comments is considered according to the standard procedure. In the register the mark about the date of submission of Article revised version is made.

14. Participation of outside reviewers is possible in the following cases: when there is no member of the Editorial Board in charge of a specific field (scientific discipline); a member of the Editorial Board is unable to prepare a review; the Editorial Board does not agree with the opinion expressed in the review of a member of the Editorial Board; the Article comes from a member of the Editorial Board. At a regular meeting of the Editorial Board the decision is made on the making a request to review the Article by a scientist having scientific papers of same issues. On behalf of the Editorial Board such scientist is sent a letter requesting for reviewing. The Article and a recommended form of review are attached to the letter.