

Approved at the meeting  
editorial Advisory Board of  
"Economic Sciences and Humanities"  
The Chairman of The Editorial Board

\_\_\_\_\_ V. A. Golenkov

**Position**  
**on reviewing the manuscripts submitted to the editorial Board of the journal**  
**"Economic Sciences and Humanities" (successor of the journal "Izvestiya, Orel state**  
**technical University. A series of "Socio-economic Sciences and Humanities"), approved at**  
**the meeting of the Editorial Board December 17, 2008**

1. As reviewers of manuscripts submitted for publication in the journal of Economic Sciences and Humanities" of renowned experts in the subject area and has in the last 3 years of publication in a peer-reviewed sources on the subject.

2. The manuscripts are reviewed are specialists with a corresponding or a higher academic degree.

3. In its review of the relevant manuscript the reviewer must determine:

- the relevance and compliance of the article to the journal;
- scientific quality and novelty present for the publication of the results, their practical importance;

- strengths and weaknesses in content and form of presentation;

- specific recommendations for the revision or reduction of the material of the article;

- the possibility (or impossibility) of publication peer-reviewed article in the journal of Economic and Humanities".

4. Review in hard copy (two copies) and in electronic form shall be submitted to the editorial office within the timelines set by the editorial staff.

5. Hard copy of the review prepared by the employee from a third party (not State University-ESPC) signed by the reviewer, and the signature attested by the seal of the organization. If the reviewer is employee of State University-ESPC, to assure the signature stamp is not required.

6. When admission to the editor of the journal of positive (or negative) reviews on this article, she met one of the members of the editorial Board, which is considered an article together with a review by the editorial Board, which decides on its publication in a journal or rejection.

7. Further work with the manuscript accepted for publication, is performed by the editorial staff in accordance with the technological process of preparation of rooms.

8. Negative reviews are sent to authors. Anonymity of reviewers is guaranteed by the editorial Board.

9. Manuscripts are subject to revision, is sent by the editorial staff authors together with the text of the review, with specific recommendations on revision of the article. The authorship of the review is also not disclosed.

10. Manuscript articles submitted after revision, together with the answer of the authors is directed to the reviewer for review and additional review. The reviewer should in due time to submit the second review, based on which the editorial Board takes the decision on admission or rejection.

11. The manuscripts are rejected by the editorial Board, the editorial staff sends the authors a notice with the wording: "Rejected by decision of the Editorial Board of the journal" with a brief rationale, for example, "article does not conform to the journal", "article not passed on competition", etc.

12. Reviews are kept in the publishing house and the editorial office within 5 years. The editors send copies of reviews to the Ministry of education and science of the Russian Federation for admission to the editor of the request.

Chief editor of the magazine  
"Economic and human Sciences"

L.V. Popova

The app

Review sample

REVIEW  
article

Author(s) \_\_\_\_\_

Name \_\_\_\_\_

The review must be commented the main provisions of the article gives a General assessment argued and conclusions about scientific significance of the work and the possibility of its publication in the journal of Economic Sciences and Humanities".

In the text of the review describes the following aspects:

- according to the journal;
- statement of the problem;
- allocation of the unsolved parts of the General problem;
- presentation of research results;
- consistency (consistency) of presentation;
- structuring of the article;
- literacy of presentation;
- compactness and clarity of illustrations;
- competent use of scientific terms;
- originality and novelty of research results;
- theoretical and practical importance of work.

Conclusion:

- a) recommend the article for publication in the journal of Economic and Humanities";
- b) to recommend an article for publication in the journal after revision;
- c) the article is not recommended for publication (reason: the discrepancy to the journal, the lack of scientific and applied results, etc.)

Reviewer \_\_\_\_\_

( scientific degree, name, signature)