

Procedure for the articles reviewing by the editorial office of the "Dynamics and vibroacoustics of machines" conference proceeding

1. Procedure for the articles reviewing

1.1 Manuscripts of scientific papers received to the editorial office of "Dynamics and vibroacoustics of machines" conference proceeding (hereinafter referred to as proceeding) are subject to obligatory reviewing.

1.2 Professionals with a recognized scientific authority and that are working in the area of knowledge to which the content of the manuscript is belonged are get involved in the articles reviewing.

1.3 The author or co-author of the article reviewing cannot be a reviewer, and candidates for a degree supervisors and department staff, in which the author(s) work(s)

1.4 Dates of the reviewing in each case are determined by the executive secretary of the editorial office, but not more than 4 months after the articles are received into the proceeding.

1.5 Reviewing is confidential. Information about reviewer is anonymous for authors and is intended only for the proceeding editorial office. The reviewer surname may be reported to the author only with the reviewer consent.

1.6 Reviewers have no right to take advantage of the information of the work content before its publication.

1.7 The review is made in two copies: one copy containing the information about the reviewer (name, contact information and signature) is remained in the proceeding editorial office, the second copy (without information about reviewer and its signature) is sent to the author(s).

1.8 Editorial office directs the review of received materials in electronic form to the author(s). Articles are modified by the author, are resent for reviewing to the same reviewer who made critical remarks or to another reviewer at the publisher discretion.

1.9 If the author disagrees with the reviewer's remarks he may apply for the re-reviewing or withdraw the paper, and he must report about his decision to the proceeding editorial office.

1.10 In the case of the negative review at the request of the author(s) the article can be send to another reviewer who does not know about previous review results. In the

case of the negative result of repeated review the reviewing copies are sent to the author(s).

1.11 In the case of refusal in the referral to the reviewing and / or in the case of deviations of the manuscript submitted by the author(s) editorial office is to inform the author(s) about reasoned justification for the refusal.

1.12 The editorial office makes the final decision about article publication after the review is made.

1.13 To publication in the Proceeding are not allowed:

- Articles, the subject of which does not apply to the scientific direction of the proceeding;
- Article is not designed properly, the authors of which refuse to make technical revision of articles;
- Articles by authors who did not amend the articles on the constructive remarks of the reviewer. The authors found guilty with plagiarism are deprived the opportunity of the articles publication in the Proceeding.

1.14 Reviews of received materials are stored in the publishing house for three years from the date of publication.

1.15 Articles reviewing payment from the authors will not be charged.

2. Requirements for the review content

2.1 Review should include the qualified analysis of the article material, objective and reasoned assessment and recommendations.

2.2 The review is compiled according to the form proposed by the editors with obligatory coverage of the following provisions:

- correspondence of the article content to its title;
- article compliance with the execution requirements;
- general description and assessment of the article content (subject, technical orientation, relevance, including set out scientific principles and results in the publication, the validity and relevance, practical perspective);
- the article content (the materials originality, the presence / absence of previously published work, the presence of erroneous statements, controversial issues, etc.);
- publication statement (clarity, conciseness, availability and completeness of bibliographic list, technical design of the text);
- the possibility of reducing the corpus of the article without prejudice to the presented scientific results and provisions understanding;
- what exactly are the positive aspects and disadvantages of articles and which corrections and additions should be made by the author(s).

2.3 The final part of the review must contain the conclusions of the article as a whole and the recommendation whether the article is should be published in the Proceeding, or sent back for revision, or is not recommended for publication.