THE PROCEDURE FOR REVIEWING MANUSCRIPTS SUBMITTED TO THE JOURNAL

##  “ELECTRONIC ENGINEERING. SERIES 3. MICROELECTRONICS"

This "Order of review of manuscripts submitted for publication in the "Electronic Engineering. Series 3. Microelectronics"" (hereinafter - the Procedure) defines the procedure for reviewing scientific articles submitted by authors for publication in the journal "Electronic Engineering. Series 3. Microelectronics"" (hereinafter - the Journal).

Each manuscript submitted to the Journal must pass a review procedure.

Manuscript of scientific articles submitted to the Journal, discusses the editor for compliance with the manuscript to the Journal profile, requirements for registration and is reviewed by a specialist.

The review carried out by one of the members of the editorial Board of the Journal, with the closest to the topic scientific specialization. The editors have the right to engage external reviewers (doctors or candidates of Sciences, including practitioners).

**Reviewers**

Reviewers are notified that the manuscripts sent to them are the intellectual property of the authors and are reportedly not subject to disclosure. Reviewers are not allowed to make copies of articles for their needs. They should not use knowledge about the content prior to its publication in their own interests. The editor will agree with the reviewer date of submission of the review to the publisher. In each case it is determined by the editorial staff with the creation of conditions for maximum rapid publication of articles.

**The order of reviewing articles**

Each manuscript submitted to the Journal must pass the procedure of reviewing (note for reviewers is presented in Appendix 1). Manuscript of scientific articles submitted to the Journal, discusses the editor for compliance with the manuscript to the Journal profile, requirements for registration and is reviewed by a specialist. The review carried out by one of the members of the editorial Board of the Journal, with the closest to the topic scientific specialization. The editors have the right to engage external reviewers (doctors or candidates of Sciences, including practitioners having recognized authority and working in the field of knowledge to which the content of a manuscript).

The reviewer cannot be the author or co-author of the reviewed work, as well as supervisors of candidates for a degree and division staff, in which the author works. If the editorial Board is unable to involve the specialist reviewing the proper level in the field of knowledge to which the content of a manuscript, the Executive Secretary refers to the author with a proposal to provide external review. At the discretion of the authors of the external review can be presented when submitting the article, which, however, does not exclude ordinary review procedure. The reviews are discussed by the editorial Board and serve as the basis for acceptance or rejection of manuscripts. The review is signed by the specialist with details of surname, name and patronymic, date, indicating the academic degree, academic title and position of the reviewer. The article sent to the editor, may be accompanied by a letter from the sending organization signed by its head (Deputy).

Submitted articles are registered and given a unique number. Manuscripts without regard to the Rules of submission and publication of copyright materials and do not contain contact information about the authors in charge of correspondence will not be considered.

The article is sent to the reviewer without giving any information about the authors. The review should objectively assess the scientific article and contain a comprehensive analysis of its scientific and methodological advantages and disadvantages. The review should be prepared on the standard form of the editorial Board or in a free form, with obligatory coverage of the following provisions.

**The content of the review should reflect the following key provisions:**

- the relevance of the article. This section includes a brief justification of the conditions that necessitated the formulation and solution of the problem (problems);

- the scientific novelty of the research area considered in the article. There must be included a brief description of the new scientific results obtained by the author (that is proven, received, installed, identified, proposed, etc.);

- the significance of the problem (task) or findings for further development of theory and practice in this area of knowledge. In this section, it should show exactly what is being developed in the study area and how this knowledge can be applied and implemented in practice;

- the sufficiency and relevance of research methods and statistical processing of materials;

- the adequacy of the research material;

- the correctness of the discussion of the results;

- compliance of conclusions with the goals and objectives of the research;

- quality of literature sources (references);

- the manuscript as a whole and its separate elements (text, tables, illustrations, bibliographic references);

- the appropriateness of the premises article tables, illustrations and their compliance with the stated theme; - the quality of an article: style, terminology, wording.

In the final part of the review should contain valid conclusions about the manuscript as a whole and a clear recommendation about the advisability of its publication in the journal or the need for its revision. In the case of a negative evaluation of the manuscript as a whole (the recommendation about inexpediency) the reviewer must justify their conclusions (Annex 2).

In case of discrepancies between the manuscript to one or more criteria, the reviewer indicates that the review the need to revise the paper and gives recommendations to the author for improvement of the manuscript (showing the author admitted inaccuracies and errors). The editorial Board informs the author of the review result. Article revised by the author are again sent for reviewing to the same reviewer who made critical remarks or to another at the discretion of the publisher. In case of conflict, the review is given to the author without giving any information about the reviewer. If an author disagrees with the reviewer's remarks he may apply for re-reviewing or withdraw the paper as recorded in the log.

**After reviewing the article may be:**

**a) rejected**

In case of rejection the editorial Board sends the author a reasoned refusal within 10 days.

Not permitted for publication:

articles that do not comply with the requirements of the editorial, the authors refuse technical revision of articles;

article, that authors do not make constructive comments of the reviewer or arguments do not refute them.

**b) sent to the author for revision**

Article accepted for publication but needs revision, it is sent to the authors with the reviewers ' comments and editor. Authors must make all necessary corrections in the final version of the manuscript and return to the editor fixed the text, and its identical electronic version together with the original version and a cover letter-response to the reviewer. The revised article re-reviewed and the editorial Board decides on publication. Articles sent to authors for correction should be returned to the editorial office no later than 7 calendar days after receipt. The return of the article at a later date changes the date of publication.

**C) accepted for publication**

The editorial Board does not store manuscripts not accepted for publication. Manuscripts accepted for publication will not be returned. The manuscripts with negative reviews are not published and are not returned to the author. The final decision on acceptance of the paper and place it in one of the rooms of the journal is taken at the meeting of the editorial Board of the journal.

The editorial Board informs about the decision of the author upon request.

Editors do not report information concerning the manuscript (including information retrieval, content, review, critical comments of reviewers and final decision) to anyone, except the authors and reviewers.

Reviewers are not allowed to make copies of manuscripts for their needs and it is forbidden to give part of the manuscript for reviewing to another person without the permission of the editors. The reviewers and the editorial staff may not use knowledge about the content prior to its publication in their own interests. The manuscripts are the private property of the authors and are reportedly not subject to disclosure. With mutual wish the author and the reviewer can communicate without the editorial Board, if it is necessary to work on the manuscript, and there are no obstacles of a personal nature.

If the publication resulted in the violation of anyone's copyright or accepted norms of scientific ethics, the editorial Board has the right to withdraw the published article

The maximum review period is from the date of receipt until a decision is 1 month.

The reviews are submitted to the HAC upon the request of expert councils.

*Annex 1*

**Note for reviewers**

Dear colleague!

Directing a review article in the journal "Electronic Engineering. Series 3. Microelectronics", you confirm that, in your opinion, this paper deserves (or not worthy) of publication.

The length of the review is entirely determined by you, but we hope that, regardless of the volume, it will contain all the necessary and objective information.

The editorial Board will ensure that your name and the fact your recommendation will not be made public.

In that case, if peer-reviewed article later will come those or other remarks or comments, at your request, you will be informed.

The editorial Board will be grateful if you could send your comments and suggestions regarding the organization of our magazine by email journal\_EEM-3@mikron.ru

The editorial Board of the journal "Electronic Engineering. Series 3. Microelectronics" sincerely thanks you for your cooperation.

*Annex 2*

FORM OF REVIEW SUBMISSION

"MERI", SC

EDITORIAL BOARD

"Electronic Engineering. Series 3. Microelectronics"

Revision:124460 Moscow, Zelenograd,

1-St Zapadniy proezd, 12, building 1

Phone: (495) 229-70-43

E-mail: vbokarev@mikron.ru

Issued to expert "\_\_" \_\_\_\_201\_ . Received from the expert "\_\_" \_\_\_\_201\_ .

**EXPERT OPINION ON THE ARTICLE**

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

(title of article, name of author (authors), scientific degree (title))

1. Circumstances that hinder an objective examination of (conflict of interest)

 present

 missing

2.The relevance of the article topics of the scientific-technical journal

 matches

 does not match

3.The quality of presentation of the article (underline):

 the abstract

 is analytical in nature, contains the results of research

4. Scientific reserve:

 article provides theoretical and empirical foundations

 article has a scientific-practical problem

 article is not a scientific elaboration of the problem solution

5. The scientific novelty of this problem

 in the article are formulated and substantiated the problem

 the article suggested research approaches to solving the problem

 article develops a known approach to solving the problem

 article does not have scientific novelty

6. The need for revision of article

 need

 no need

7.Expert assessment

 article can be accepted for publication without changes

 the article can be published after revision and re-review

 article may not be accepted for publication

8.Conclusions\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

(justification of assessment decisions on the publication, revision or rejection of the article)

Expert\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Name of the expert, scientific degree (title), organization, (signed)

position, contact addresses: E-mail; tel. (with city code);

Fax (with area code); email address (with index)