

## Regulations

### for reviewing the manuscripts submitted for publication in scientific journal "Bulletin of the Perm State University. Series Biology"

#### 1. GENERAL POINTS

1.1 This Regulation establishes the procedure for reviewing the original articles (materials) and the requirements for the review, in the coming edition of the scientific journal "Bulletin of the Perm State University. Biology Series " (hereinafter referred to as "Editorial Board").

1.2 Review (expert estimation) of manuscripts of scientific articles in the Editorial Board is made for the selection of the most valuable and actual (prospective) scientific works that maintain a high level of scientific journals in general. Promotion of relevant research by evaluating manuscripts by highly qualified experts.

1.3 All materials submitted for publication in the journal should be reviewed.

1.4 There are following basic concepts in this Regulation:

The author - a person or group of persons (group of authors), involved in the creation of article based on the results of scientific research.

Editor in Chief - the person heading the editorial board who makes the final decision on the production and issue of the journal.

Executive secretary of the editorial board - a specialist who organizes and controls the planning, terms and qualitative preparation of materials for publication of the journal.

Plagiarism - intentional appropriation of authorship of the work of science or art, others' ideas or inventions. Plagiarism may be a violation of copyright law, patent law, and as such may result in legal liability.

Editor - a representative of the scientific journal or publishing house who prepares materials for publication, and also supports communication with authors and readers of scientific publications.

Editorial Board - an advisory body of eminent persons group, which helps a chief editor in the selection, preparation and evaluation of works for publication.

Reviewer - expert acting on behalf of a scientific journal or publishing house and conducting scientific expertise of materials to determine whether they are suitable for publishing.

Reviewing - review procedure of the materials proposed to the publication to determine whether it should be published, identifying its strengths and weaknesses, which is important for the improvement of the manuscript by the author and the publisher.

Manuscript - a work proposed by the author for publication in a scientific journal (handwritten, typewritten, typed on a computer).

#### 2. RULES FOR SUBMISSIONS FOR REVIEW

2.1 Only articles formatted in accordance with the terms of reception of manuscripts, are submitted to review.

2.2 Article materials should be free of any restrictions. Submissions must be open. Restrictions are the basis for rejecting the article.

2.3 Subject to the requirements, the editors accept the manuscript. The chief editor sends it for review.

### 3. ORGANIZATION OF THE REVIEWING

3.1 Reviewers are the scientists with a recognized authority and working in the field of knowledge close to the content of the manuscript. They have publications on the subject of the reviewed article during last three years.

Employees of outside scientific organizations may be asked for reviewing.

The reviewer should have a doctorate degree or PhD.

3.2 Reviewers are required to follow the university adopted the "Regulations on the ethical standards of the editorial policy of the Perm State National Research University".

3.3 If the author is a doctoral candidate, postgraduate degrees and PhD candidate, he sent to the editorial review of his article at the same time with the article, or an extract from the minutes of the profile department with the recommendation to publish the article or review (letter of recommendation) of the supervisor to justification of the relevance and consistency of the manuscript requirements for scientific articles. Graduate students also submit a certificate of education (academic) organizations certified its stamp on the postgraduate studies.

3.4 Editorial welcomes third-party review (as a supplement), provided by other authors, but it does not exempt them from carrying out the review, mandatory for all incoming manuscripts.

3.5 Editorial Boards use 4-level system of reviewing:

1 level - checking the article of the presence of borrowed text. It is obligatory for all manuscripts. The editorial board tries all articles through the "Anti-plagiarism". If the original text is below 85% (the loan from one source cannot be more than 7%), the article is sent back to the author for improvement, with justification. Borrowings from sites of student work are not allowed.

2 level - open reviewing (open peer review - authors and reviewers know each other). Review by the author, at his request.

3 level - single blind review (single-blind - the reviewer knows about the author, the author doesn't know about the reviewer). It is required for all articles.

4 level - double-blind review (double-blind - authors and reviewers do not know about each other).

3.6. If the manuscript is sufficiently justified it may be sent for further review.

- 3.7. The reviewer should check the article in a target dates and provide the editors properly issued review, or a reasoned refusal to review.
- 3.8. Dates of review in each case are determined according to conditions for the most rapid publication of the article, but not more than 15 days after receipt of the application for publication by the journal. The period may be extended, if necessary, in the case of additional review and / or temporary absence of the reviewer.
- 3.9. The review of submissions to the journal is carried out in compliance with the confidentiality and the name of the reviewer is not reported to the author (s).
- 3.10. On the basis of reviews and recommendations the Editorial Board adopted the following decisions at a meeting:
  - 3.10.1 In the case of a positive decision of the reviewers and the positive recommendations the manuscript is approved for publication in the one issue of the journal.
  - 3.10.2 In case of disagreement of the reviewers and / or recommendations (review - positive, recommendations - negative) the final decision about the publication of the manuscript is accepted by Editor in chief.
  - 3.10.3 If reviews or recommendations contain significant criticism and conclusion of the improvement of the article, the manuscript is returned to the author to be improved. The modified version of the article can be sent for re-review by the decision of the Editorial Board. In case of repeated negative result of reviewing the manuscript is rejected and is not subject to further review.
- 3.11. The article, sent to the editor after improvement is re-reviewed by the same or another reviewer - appointed at the discretion of the editors.
- 3.12. The originals of reviews are stored within 5 years. At the request of the Ministry of Education and Science of the Russian Federation (Ministry of Education) the review must be submitted to the Higher Attestation Commission and / or the Ministry of Education.
- 3.13. The author has the right to read the text of the reviews.

#### 4. REQUIREMENTS FOR REVIEW

- 4.1. Editorial board recommends to use the standard form for reviewing (Appendix 1).
- 4.2. At the coordination of the chief editor the review may be made in the free form.
- 4.3. The review should objectively assess the scientific article and contain a comprehensive analysis of its scientific and methodological advantages and disadvantages. It should include reasoned assessment of scientific (theoretical, methodological and conceptual) level of the article; the relevance of the problem posed in the article, novelty and originality of the scientific material; scientific and practical significance of the study; level of promotion of the scientific concepts development; the accuracy of the information cited by the author; the accuracy of using the definitions and wording by the author; the validity of the findings; representativeness of practical material, attracted to the analysis; the illustrativeness of examples, tables and

figures cited by the author; a general list and analysis of all detected shortcomings and a lack of plagiarism; and the general conclusion of the publication of the article or its rejection and rework.

An essential element of the review is the assessment of personal contribution of the author in resolving the issues. The review should also evaluate logic, language and style of presentation, their conformity with the requirements and standards of the literary and scientific language.

Review should be signed with original signature of the reviewer and certified by personnel service on the main job of the reviewer.

4.4. As a result of the review the reviewer can show to the editorial board of one of the following decisions:

- Article is recommended for publication in the journal (without modification);
- Article is recommended for publication in the journal after improvement (without re-review);
- Article requires revision and re-review;
- This article is not suitable for publication.

Editor in Chief of the

"Bulletin of the Perm State University

Biology Series"

PhD, Professor

N.I. Litvinenko