

PROCEDURE OF REVIEWING THE MANUSCRIPTS SUBMITTED FOR PUBLICATION IN THE BULLETIN OF FISHERIES SCIENCE JOURNAL

This Procedure of reviewing the manuscripts submitted for publication in The Bulletin of Fisheries Science Journal determines the procedure of reviewing the manuscripts of scientific articles submitted by the authors for publication in the journal.

The publication shall review all incoming materials to the editor corresponding to its category, with a view to peer review.

All scientific articles received by the editorial office of the journal are reviewed according to the established procedure.

The manuscript of the scientific article received by the editorial office of the journal is considered by the editor in chief for conformity of the manuscript of the scientific article to the specialty of the journal. The executive editor determines the compliance with the makeup requirements and sends it to be reviewed by a specialist, doctor of science or candidate of science whose scientific specialization is close to the topic of the article. All reviewers are acknowledged experts on the subject of peer-reviewed materials and have for the past three years, publications on peer-reviewed articles. Manuscripts which fail to comply with the makeup rules approved for the authors of The Bulletin of Fisheries Science Journal are returned to the authors without being considered.

The reviews are confidential. The assigned reviewer is provided with the manuscript in a printed and electronic format (Winword-7), the author's card and contact information of the author(s) for quick communication of the editorial office and authors.

The maximum review period is three weeks. This period is controlled by the editorial office depending on the situation and can be extended upon the reviewer's request.

The executive editor sends the review prepared within the set timeframe to the author together with the article for the author to familiarize himself with the text of the review. The reviews are certified in accordance with the procedure established at the institution where the reviewer works.

If the review contains recommendations for rework of the article, the executive editor of the editorial office of the journal sends the text with corrections and notes to the author. The article reworked by the author is sent for review again.

In case of insoluble contradictions between the author and the reviewer regarding the scientific content of the article the editorial board is entitled to send the article to another reviewer. The final decision in such cases is made by the editor in chief.

An article not recommended by the reviewer for publication is not accepted for repeated consideration. The notice about a negative review as well as nonconformity of the article to the topic of the journal is sent to the author by e-mail, fax or common post.

Publishing Issue sends to the authors of submissions copies of reviews or a reasoned refusal, and also undertakes to send copies of reviews to the Ministry of Education and Science of the Russian Federation for admission to the editors of publication of the corresponding request.

If the editorial board decides to admit the article to publication the executive editor informs the author thereof and states the time of the publication. Reviews are stored in the publishing house and editorial office for five years.

With a view to receiving the fullest and most objective review of the article the editorial office has developed a memo for the reviewer with the list of the issues the coverage of which in the article is to be evaluated by the reviewer.

On the grounds of the evaluation the reviewer draws his conclusion about further destiny of the article:

- the article is recommended for publication as it is;
- with account of correction of the shortcomings noted by the reviewer;
- denial of publication.

Memo to the reviewer

When evaluating the article and writing a review the reviewer should stick to the following issues:

- Originality of the work, novelty of obtained data.
- Relevance of the topic.
- Conformity of the article to the modern state of the subject being studied.
- Clarity of material presentation.
- Detailed description of the materials and research methods.
- Adequacy of selected research methods.
- Conformity of the results to the set research objectives.
- Validity of conclusions.
- Visual aspects of material presentation (availability of tables and figures).
- Compliance of the article makeup with the rules for authors.
- Availability of the comparison of own data with the data contained in literature.
- Availability of references to all significant publications on the topic of the work.