

## **MANUSCRIPTS REVIEW ORDER OF JOURNAL “ANTHROPOLOGICAL MEASUREMENTS OF PHILOSOPHICAL RESEARCH”**

All articles are reviewed (procedure of scientific expertise) by the editorial board, except reviews and information messages. Editorial board determined the following procedure of manuscripts review:

1. The author provides an article in to editorial board meeting the requirements of journal “Anthropological Measurements of Philosophical Research” policy and preparation rules of articles for publishing. Manuscripts which are not met requirements are not registered and allowed to further examination. Authors are informed about this.

2. Each article is received by editorial board, passes 3 levels of review (scientific expertise) on the type of study: Open – internal and external and “blind” (see “Ethics Code of journal publications...”). Recommendation of external (open) reviewer, who can not be scientific supervisor of an author/applicant for a degree, is the basis for further implementation of internal and “blind” of manuscript reviewing.

3. Editor-in-chief reviews articles and appoints reviewers corresponding to research profile of journal column “Anthropological Measurements of Philosophical Research”. Appointment of reviewers could be entrusted to the editorial board members by the decision of a journal editor-in-chief (in certain circumstances). In particular cases, a matter of choice of reviewers is decided at the session of editorial board. Some articles of outstanding scientists and authors that are specially invited by editors for article writing could be exempted from the standard procedure of reviewing by the decision of the journal editor-in-chief (in accordance with recommendations of columns executive editor).

4. For manuscripts review both editorial board members of scientific journal “Anthropological Measurements of Philosophical Research” and third-party qualified specialists with deep professional knowledge and experience in particular scientific field (usually, PhD and professors) can be as reviewers.

5. Internal review is conducted within 21 days after registration of manuscript in editorial board. In case of positive review of internal reviewer, manuscript copy will be sent to type of scientific research on the “blind” reviewing by leading specialists in the field of article issues. After scientist consent, conducting “blind” review to the possibility of materials reviewing (based on correspondence of his own qualification to the authors’ research direction and absence of any conflict of interests), and scientific peer-review of an article usually occurs within 90 days. In each particular case, review periods can be changed with creation of conditions for most objective quality evaluation of materials.

6. Authors and reviewers cooperation occurs by means of e-mail correspondence through the executive editor of certain journal column “Anthropological Measurements of Philosophical Research” or by using OJS (Open Journal Systems) publishing platform. An Author and reviewer cooperation may occur in the mode of direct personal contact at request of reviewer and with agreement of editorial board working party (this decision is made if only cooperation openness improves the style and logic of material reviewing presentation).

7. If reviewer points to necessity of making certain adjustments in an article, the article will be sent to the author with the proposal to take into account all comments in preparation of updated version of the article or convincingly to refute them. With the corrected article, the author adds a message that contains answers to all comments and explains all changes have been made in the article. Reviewer re-takes amended version of the article for making decision and preparation of reasoned decision about the possibility of publication. Date of the article receipt for publication is the date of reception by editors of reviewer positive conclusion (or decisions of editorial board) about practicability and possibility of the article publishing.

8. In case of disagreement with the reviewer opinion, the author of manuscript has the right to provide reasons response to journal editors. In this case, the article is reviewed at the session of editorial board working group. The Editorial Board sends the article for additional or new review by another specialist. In case of inability or unwillingness of the author to accommodate the wishes and comments of reviewer, editorial board reserves the right to reject articles.

9. After receiving of positive reviews manuscripts are sent to literary and technical editing. The author and literary (technical) editor cooperation could be in any form – personally, e-mail, Skype, phone. Minor stylistic and formal corrections, which do not affect on the article content, are made by literary (technical) editor without the author agreement.

10. Final decision concerning possibility and practicability of publication is made by the editor-in-chief in accordance with recommendation of journal executive secretary. After decision on admission of the article for publication executive secretary of journal reports about this to the author and indicates the expected date of publication.

11. Recommendation about publication of the next issue of journal (with indication of content) is made by Academic Council of Dnipropetrovsk National University of Railway Transport named after Academician V. Lazaryan and recorded in relevant minutes.