

Procedure of criticizing

Every article, presented in the release of Collection, passes necessarily the procedure of criticizing. It is orientated on the maximally objective and impartial estimation of maintenance of the scientific article, determination of its accordance to the international requirements which are pulled (or produced) out to the articles of scientific editions, competent, comprehensive and sound analysis of both positive internals of the articles and its concrete defects and provides for the following:

1. Scientific articles, which come to editorship, are passing the primary control viewing the Collection profile, completeness and accuracy of their execution according the [Collection rules of execution](#), shown on the site.

2. Primary expert evaluation of scientific article is done by the Main Editor or the Deputy Editor.

3. All manuscripts which enter editorial college will be given to one, and if necessary – to two reviewers according to the type of their researches. The editor-in-chief of the Collection appoints the reviewers. Under certain circumstances the editor-in-chief can charge setting of reviewers to the member of editorial college. In some cases the question of the choice of reviewers can be decided on meeting of editorial college. On decision of editor-in-chief the urgent articles of the prominent scientists which are given to editing on initiative and request of the editorial board, can be released from standard procedure of criticizing.

4. Criticizing is conducted confidentially on principle of double-blind (bilateral «blind» co-operation, when neither author nor reviewer knows about each other). Communication between author and reviewers takes place virtually (by e-mail, or through the responsible secretary of the collection of scientific works). At the instance of a reviewer and in concordance with the working group of editorial college the co-operation between the author and a reviewer can happen in the open mode (such decision is accepted only in case when a direct interpersonal co-operation will allow the improvement of style and logic of the research material exposition). In case of refuse from principles of double-blind criticizing, the last name of a reviewer can be indicated only after the publication of the article. The editorial college must trace, that at least three articles in every producing were examined in the mode of the double-blind criticizing.

5. In some cases (foreseen by editorial board) one side «blind» viewing of the article in the single –blind mode (the Reviewer knows the Author's name, the Author does not know the Reviewer's name) are admitted, if it contributes to the article improvement and the harmonization of the scientific communication.

6. For the analysis of articles as the reviewers can be invited except the members of Editorial college and Editorial council of Collection the others – home

and foreign highly skilled specialists (mostly doctors of sciences, professors), which own the fundamental psycholinguistic knowledge, competences and experience in this scientific direction.

7. A reviewer can not be a co-author of the article which is criticized, and also scientific leaders of scientific degree obtainers.

8. On receipt by editorial board of the manuscript of article, a reviewer in a 7-daily term estimates the possibility of materials observation, coming from accordance of the own qualification in direction of researches of the author of article and absence of any conflict of scientific interests. In case of presence of any prejudice and contradictory of interests which are in a state of competition or different looks, a reviewer must refuse from examination of the article and report the editorial college about it. The last must decide a question in relation to setting of other expert.

9. The Reviewer sends a conclusion to the Editorial Board of Collection about the appropriateness or inappropriateness of the article publishing. The terms of viewing in every special case can be changed according to the conditions, creation of which are necessary for the optimal objective valuation of the manuscript.

10. After final observation of the article a reviewer fills the standardized form (reference) which contains his final conclusions. At preparation of this form was used and generalized by editorial board the position of confessed recommendations in relation to the procedure of criticizing [Review Quality Instrument](#).

11. The release of Collection sends to an e-mail of the author a report with the results of analysis of the article.