

**Procedure for review of manuscripts
submitted to be published in the Scientific and Practice Periodical
“Nuclear and Radiation Safety”**

1. Each manuscript (hereinafter to be referred to as the Article), submitted to be published in the section “Articles” of the Scientific and Practice Periodical “Nuclear and Radiation Safety” (hereinafter to be referred to as the Periodical), shall be obligatory subject to the review procedure.
2. Contributor has a right to submit by himself the review for his Article signed by an independent specialist in the relevant field of science and/or practice. In this case, the editorial board of the Periodical has a right to forward the Article to the additional review at its own discretion.
3. The Article submitted to the Periodical is to be checked by the Chief Editor for the Article compliance with the Periodical profile and is forwarded to be reviewed.
4. Leading scientists in the relevant field of scientific knowledge are involved into the review of Articles submitted to be published. Reviewers can be the members of the Editorial Board of the Periodical, as well as highly qualified external experts and specialists-practitioners. A Reviewer must have a science degree of Ph.D. or D.Sc. or a 5-year practical experience in this field (at the least). Academic Advisor of the Contributor or specialists working in the same scientific and research division, where the work was performed, cannot be involved in the Review.
5. Reviewers shall be notified that the Articles forwarded to them are considered to be a private property of Contributors and are assigned to confidential information. Reviewers are prohibited to make any copies of the Articles for their own needs.
6. Review shall be carried out confidentially. The Contributor of the reviewed Article shall be allowed to read the text of the review, if he does not agree with the conclusions of the Reviewer.
7. Breach of confidentiality is possible in case the Reviewer states about inaccuracy or falsification of materials set out in the Article.
8. A Reviewer (member of the Editorial Board or an independent expert) shall draw a conclusion on possibility of the Article publication within 30 days.
9. The Editorial Board shall notify the Contributor by e-mail about the results of the review.

10. If the review for the Article states the necessity of the Article amendment, the article shall be sent to the Contributor for perfection.
11. If the opinion of the Contributor of the Article contradicts to the opinion of the Reviewer, the former has a right to provide an argumentative response to the Editorial Board of the Periodical. The Article can be forwarded to be reviewed repeatedly or to be approved by the Editorial Board.
12. The decision on the expedience of publication upon review shall be taken by the Chief Editor or by the Editorial Board on the whole, if necessary.
13. In case of a positive decision the Chief Editor of the Periodical shall specify the sequence of publications in the Periodical.
14. The Editorial Board assumes no liability regarding the issuance dates.
15. Reviews shall remain deposited in the publishing office and editorial office of the publication within a 5-year period.
16. Reviews can be forwarded to the Ministry of Education and Science of the Russian Federation upon the relevant request to the editorial office of the Periodical "Nuclear and Radiation Safety".

REVIEW SUBMISSION FORM

To the Editorial Board of the Scientific and Practice Periodical
“Nuclear and Radiation Safety”

REVIEW

I, (full name), recommend
the Article _____

(Title of the Article)

Of the Contributors _____

(List of Contributors)

to be published in the Scientific and Practice Periodical “Nuclear and Radiation Safety”

TEXT OF REVIEW ¹

.....
.....

Information about the

Reviewer: _____

Full name; science degree; academic rank, organization, job position

Contacts: E-mail; tel. (incl. city code); fax (incl. city code); postal address (incl. postal code)

Reviewer's signature

1. *The review highlights the following issues:*

- *whether the Article content complies with the topic stated in the title;*
- *whether the Article corresponds to the present-day development of scientific and theory based knowledge;*
- *whether the Article is comprehensible to readers it was intended for, in the context of language, style, material allocation, demonstrativeness of tables, diagrams, figures and formula;*
- *whether the Article publishing is expedient with the account of the previously issued literature related to this issue;*
- *what are the positive aspects, as well as deficiencies of the Article, what amendments and addenda shall be introduced by the Contributor.*

The Reviewer has a right to give recommendations to the Contributor and to the Editorial Board on the Article perfection. Comments and suggestions of the Reviewer shall be unprejudiced and essential, aimed at upgrading of the scientific and methodological rank of the Article.

The final part of the review shall contain the substantiated conclusions about the Article on the whole and the clear recommendation on the expedience of its publishing in the public media and shall contain one of the following decisions:

- *to recommend to accept the Article for publishing in the public media;*
- *to recommend to accept the Article for publishing in the public media upon introduction of a technical correction;*
- *to recommend to accept the Article for publishing in the public media upon meeting the Reviewer's comments by the Contributor, with follow-up forwarding of the Article to the same Reviewer to be reviewed repeatedly;*
- *to recommend to reject publishing of the Article in the public media due to its non-compliance with the requirements to the Periodical scientific rank (in this case the Article, which is not recommended by the Reviewer for publishing, shall not be accepted for the repeated review). The text of the negative review shall be forwarded to the Contributor by e-mail, by fax or by post.*

In case of negative evaluation of the Article on the whole, the Reviewer shall give persuasive substantiation to his conclusions.