ETHICAL GUIDELINES FOR PEER REVIEWERS

**The basic principles for reviewers.**

**Reviewers should:**

• to agree to review only those manuscripts for assessment which they have sufficient knowledge, and they can review in a timely manner;

• to respect the confidentiality of the review and not reveal any details of a manuscript, or reviews during or after reviewing to anyone except those persons to whom it is allowed by the journal;

• not use information obtained in the course of the review, for their own benefit or benefit of other persons or entities or harm to other persons or discrediting other persons;

• declare all potential conflicts of interest and to seek advice from the journal if they are unsure whether the existing situation is a conflict of interest or not;

• do not allow the content of their reviews was influenced by the origin of the manuscript, by the nationality, religious affiliation, political or other views of its authors, or commercial considerations;

• to write the review objectively and constructively, refraining from hostile or inflammatory statements, and also from defamatory or derogatory comments;

• understand that, as researchers, they do need honest reviews of their colleagues, and therefore to perform peer review in good faith;

• provide logs accurate and truthful information about their personal and professional knowledge and experience;

• recognize that attempts to impersonate another person during the review are a serious violation of appropriate conduct.

**How should the review process**

**During the preparation for the review**

**Reviewers should:**

• quickly enough to respond to an offer to write a review, especially if they do not intend to write;

• if they are not familiar with the subject of study for writing reviews, to state that explicitly, but if they can only assess a part of the manuscript, describe the boundaries of the area in which they have sufficient knowledge;

• to agree to review manuscripts only if they are sure that they will be able to prepare a review within the proposed or mutually agreed time, promptly notifying the journal, if they need renewal;

• declare all potential conflicts of interest (regarding, for example, personal, financial, intellectual, professional, political or religious interests) and to seek advice from the journal if they are unsure whether the existing situation is a conflict of interest or not;

• follow policies of the journal in situations that, in their opinion, may prevent objective review. Unless otherwise specified in the rules, they must notify the journal if they work in the same organization, and one of the authors (or soon will work in this organization or apply for employment in the organization); if they are or were in the recent past (e.g. within last 3 years) teachers of some of the authors, their students, family and staff or share grants, or they have a close personal relationship with any of the authors;

• re-review any manuscript which they had already reviewed for another journal, since the text could change, and criteria for publication of articles from journals can be different;

• ensure that proposals for alternative reviewers are made impartially, and are not the result of personal preference or made to the manuscript have received some evaluation (positive or negative);

• not agree to review the manuscript only to read it, with no intention of peer reviewing;

• to abandon the preparation of the review, if you feel that you will not be able to make impartial and fair evaluation;

• to abandon the preparation of the review if you have participated in any work related to the preparation of the manuscript, or discussed in her research;

• to abandon the preparation of the review if asked to review a manuscript that is very similar to their peer-reviewed for another journal or proposed for review;

• to abandon the preparation of the review, if you do not agree with the rules of peer review, accepted in the journal (if the journal uses open peer review reports or the names of reviewers to authors) that may impact either on their review, or to devalue for the reason that they will not be able to effectively fulfill the requirements of the journal.

**Review**

**Reviewers should:**

• notify the journal immediately and seek advice if they found any conflict of interest that was not seen when they agreed to take an article for review, or any other circumstances that prevent them form a fair and impartial assessment of the article;

• to refrain from the study of manuscripts and related materials while waiting for instructions from a journal on issues that may lead to the request for termination of the agreement for review;

• carefully read the manuscript, ancillary material (e.g., instructions for reviewers, as required by ethical guidelines and policies, files, applications) and instructions of the journal, referring to the journal if you have any questions and requesting the missing information necessary to produce high-quality reviews;

• as soon as possible to notify the journal if they find that they have sufficient knowledge to evaluate all aspects of the manuscript without waiting for the date of the review, because it unduly delay the review process;

• do not engage anyone to conduct a review, including his assistants, without the prior consent of the journal; the names of all the persons who helped the reviewers to write reviews, must be included in the text so that the fact of their participation was registered in the journal, and the journal could Express gratitude to them;

• do not expose to the public any details of the manuscript and review;

• report to the log if there are circumstances that prevent them from timely preparation of review, providing an accurate estimate of the time that they need, if the journal does not appoint instead another reviewer;

• in the case of "double-blind" review, if they know the name of the author(s), inform journal, if such knowledge may cause a conflict of interest;

• promptly notify the journal if they found errors in the work, concerned about the ethics of work, learned about the substantial similarity between the manuscript and other document, or suspect that during the study or sending the manuscript to the journal took place fraudulent conduct; at the same time, reviewers should keep their concerns confidential and not to investigate further the circumstances of the case, unless the journal does not appeal to them for help;

• not to delay the review process, delaying the submission of their review or by requesting unnecessary additional information from the journal or the author;

• ensure that the assessment contained in their reviews, based on the qualities of the work, and it does not affect (neither better nor worse) any personal, financial or other considerations, as well as intellectual passion;

• do not speak directly to the authors, without prior permission of the journal.

**During the preparation of the review**

**Reviewers should:**

• remember that the editor expects them to domain expertise, common sense, and honest and fair assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of the work and the manuscript;

• if the review (at the request of the journal) touches on only some aspects of the work, indicate this at the beginning of the review, and clearly indicate which aspects;

• follow the journal's instructions on the specific feedback that is required of them, and if there is no good reason not to implement such communication should be organized;

• write an objective and constructive review, which can help authors to improve their manuscript;

• do not allow derogatory personal comments or unfounded accusations;

• be specific in their criticism and acknowledging solid evidence and appropriate references his overall conclusions, such as "this work was made earlier" to help editors create a correct assessment and decision in compliance with the objective attitude to authors;

• remember that it is the author's job, and not try to rewrite it to suit your style and preference, if it generally qualitative and written clearly; although proposals to improve clarity always welcome;

* to maintain sensitivity in matters of language, if the authors are writing in a language that is not native to them, and formulate their comments accordingly and with due respect;

• make clear what is proposed, additional research can support the conclusions made in the manuscript, and may enhance or expand work;

• not writing a review so that there is reason to believe that it was written by another person;

• not to portray in my review of other people in a negative light, or biased;

• not make unfair negative comments or unwarranted criticism of any work of competitors indicated in the manuscript;

• ensure that comments and recommendations addressed to the editor, are in agreement with the report addressed to the authors; most of the information should be included in the report submitted by authors;

• confidential comments sent to the editor should not contain slander and false accusations against the authors made in the belief that the authors will not see these comments;

• not to suggest to authors to include in your post links to the reviewer's (or his colleagues) just to increase the citation or the visibility of their work; all suggestions to the authors should be based only on the basis of their scientific or technological value;

• to determine whether the policy of the journal to sign their reviews and, if so, to decide whether it is convenient for them to do it;

• if the editor is working with the manuscript, he decided to write her a review, it should do so transparently, not posing as anonymous reviewers (if the journal practices anonymous review); but writing a review of the paper that you are working with another editor of the journal, can be treated as any other review.

**After the preparation of the review**

**The experts should:**

• continue to keep details of the manuscript and its review in secrecy;

• quickly reply if you have any questions on the part of the journal related to the manuscript, and provide the necessary information;

• contact the journal if after submitting my review, they learned some important facts that could affect their initial opinion and recommendations;

• read reviews of other reviewers, if they are provided by the journal, to improve their understanding of the topic or its findings in relation to the work;

• to fulfill requests from journals to review made to the manuscript changes or a new version of the manuscript.
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