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**Regulations**

 **for reviewing manuscripts submitted for publication**

**in the "Social and Labor Research"** **scientific journal**

**1. General requirements**

1.1. These Regulations for reviewing manuscripts submitted for publication in the "Social and Labor Research" scientific and practical journal (hereinafter - the Regulations) regulate the procedure for reviewing author articles and materials (hereinafter - the Article) received by the editorial board of the scientific and practical journal "Social and labor research "(hereinafter - the Journal).

1.2. The review is carried out in order to select the most relevant, original materials, notable for scientific novelty, to improve the quality of published Articles and to ensure a high scientific level of the Journal.

1.3.The review is carried out by members of the editorial board. The board includes candidates and doctors of science (or holders of foreign scientific degrees of a similar level) employed at the main place of work for conducting scientific research and / or teaching in higher educational institutions. Peer review is also carried out by third-party experts on behalf of the editorial board. All reviewers must be recognized experts on the subject of peer-reviewed materials. They should have publications on the subject of the reviewed article and h-index, as a rule, not less than 10. The signature on the review must be certified in the prescribed manner at the place of work of the reviewer, if a third-party specialist is involved.

1.4. All submitted materials corresponding to the remit of the Journal are reviewed for the purpose of their expert evaluation and compliance with the requirements posted on the Journal’s website.

1.5.Reference materials, reviews, comments, etc. not subject to review.

1.6.The editorial board organizes and conducts double-blind peer review (the reviewer does not know who the author of the article is; the author of the article does not know who the reviewer is).

1. **Rules for reviewing articles**

2.1. The editorial board of the Journal reviews all incoming articles corresponding to the remit of the Journal for the purpose of their expert evaluation. Articles that do not correspond to the remit of the Journal are not accepted for consideration.

2.2.The reviewer is appointed in accordance with the profile of the Article submitted to the editors of the Journal.

2.3.Peer review is carried out on a voluntary basis and for a fee.

2.4. Reviewers are notified that the articles submitted to them are the intellectual property of the authors and relate to sensitive information.

2.5. The reviewing periods are determined by the issuing editor considering the planned publication dates of the Journal.

2.6. The review must cover the following points:

- title of the article, full names of the authors (if they are known to the reviewer);

- correspondence to the remit of the Journal;

- clarity of a scientific problem;

- relevance, originality and scientific (practical) significance of the research;

- theoretical and methodological base of research;

- accuracy of information used by the author;

- validity of the findings;

- representativeness and accuracy of bibliography;

- correct use of terms;

- relevance and accuracy of the drawings, tables and formulas;

- clarity, informative title of the Article;

- correct choice of keywords;

- quality of the abstract (completeness and conciseness of the reflection of the Article’s content).

2.7. All comments made by the reviewer must be specified, and negative ratings must be reasoned.

2.8. Recommended review volume must be at least 3600 characters.

2.9. Printed and electronic versions of the review are sent to the issuing editor.

2.10. The review concludes with a general assessment of the Article and the reviewer's recommendation for publication in the Journal: “Recommended for publication”, “Recommended for publication after revision or remark correction after the second review”, “The article is not recommended for publication”. In case of a positive review, the article is published according to the standard procedure.

2.11. The editors send to the authors of the submitted materials a copy of the reviews or a motivated refusal, signed by the editor-in-chief of the Journal. If the reviewer recommends the Article for publication after revision or remark correction or does not recommend the Article, the review indicates the specific reasons for such a decision with a clear statement of the shortcomings identified in the Article.

2.12.If the review contains recommendations for correcting and revising the Article, the publishing editor sends a copy of the review to the author (not specifying the surname, first name, patronymic name, position, place of work of the reviewer) proposing to consider the recommendations when preparing a new version of the Article.

2.13.The finalized article is sent by the author to the editors. It is reviewed according to the standard procedure and sent for the second review along with the author’s response to all comments.

2.14.The editorial board has the right not to accept the author's material for publication in the following cases:

- noncompliance with the rules of the Article by the authors;

- identifying the elements of borrowing (plagiarism);

- inconsistency of the Article to the remit of the Journal;

- negative assessment of the Article submitted for publication by the reviewer.

2.15.The originals of the reviews are kept in the Journal’s editorial office for five years from the moment they are signed by the reviewer.

2.16.When a corresponding request is received from the Ministry of Science and Higher Education of the Russian Federation, the editorial board must send copies of all requested reviews to the Ministry.