

**THE PROCEDURE FOR REVIEWING
manuscripts of articles submitted to the editorial office of the scientific and
technical journal "Radioelectronic industry: problems and their solutions"**

Each received manuscript is subject to a review procedure - review and expert evaluation by reviewers of a scientific article proposed for publication in order to determine the expediency of its publication in the scientific and technical journal "Radioelectronic Industry: Problems and their solutions" (hereinafter – the journal).

To carry out the review procedure, the author must submit to the editorial board:

- manuscript in paper and electronic form (see "Rules and requirements for articles published in the journal "Radioelectronic industry: problems and their solutions");
- drawings, tables, photographs and other illustrative material in pdf format;
- certificate of anti-plagiarism check (screen of the results of the check on the website);
- conclusion on the absence of information constituting a state secret.

If the article does not meet the minimum requirements (in terms of subject matter, scientific level, availability of scientific results, design and more than 25% of borrowings from other sources (anti-plagiarism)), then the author is sent a reasoned refusal with the number of the protocol of refusal to publish for the signature of the editor-in-chief. Otherwise, the manuscript is reviewed.

The review of articles involves members of the Editorial Board and the Editorial Board who have an academic degree, recognized authority and work in the field of knowledge to which the content of the manuscript belongs. The reviewer (an expert acting on behalf of the editorial board of the journal and conducting a scientific examination of the author's materials in order to determine the possibility of their publication) cannot be the author or co-author of the reviewed work, as well as scientific supervisors of applicants for an academic degree and employees of the department in which the author works.

The article is submitted to the reviewer without specifying any information about the authors in order to protect copyrights. Reviewers are not allowed to make copies of manuscripts, as well as transfer the manuscript for review to another person without the permission of the editorial board. Reviewers have no right to disclose

the information contained in the article, to take advantage of knowledge about the content of the work before its publication. If necessary, the manuscript is sent to two reviewers (for example, when its topic is at the junction of various scientific disciplines).

2. If there are comments in the received review, the author is recommended to finalize the text of the manuscript taking into account the recommendations.

3. If the review is positive and contains no comments, then the manuscript is submitted to the editor-in-chief (deputy editor-in-chief) for further publication.

4. The revised version is sent to the reviewer for re-review. Further, see paragraphs 2 and 3.

5. The review should contain a comprehensive analysis of the manuscript of the article. The review is compiled in a free form, as a rule, highlighting the following provisions:

5.1 Relevance of the topic of the article (required).

5.2 Scientific novelty of the research direction considered in the article (required).

5.3 Importance of the problem (task) statement or the results obtained for the further development of theory and practice in the field of knowledge under consideration (required).

5.4 Adequacy and modernity of research methods and statistical processing of materials.

5.5 Sufficiency of the research material (required).

5.6 Correctness of the discussion of the results obtained. Compliance of the conclusions with the goals and objectives of the study.

5.7 The quality of the study of literary sources (references).

5.8 The expediency of including tables and illustrative material in the article and their correspondence to the topic being presented.

5.9 The quality of the article design: style, terminology, wording.

6. The final part of the review should contain a recommendation on the expediency of its publication or on the need for its revision (indicating the inaccuracies and errors made by the author).

7. The review is signed by a specialist with a transcript of the surname, first name and patronymic, date, indicating the academic degree, academic title and position held by the reviewer.

8. The review period of the article is no more than two weeks from the date of receipt to the reviewer. The editorial board introduces the author to the result of the review. At the request of the author of the article, he is provided with a review without specifying any information about the reviewer.

9. If there are comments in the review, recommendations on the need to finalize the article, the manuscript is sent to the author for revision. The article, finalized by the author, is sent for re-examination.

10. If there is a negative review, the article will not be accepted for publication. Manuscripts that are not accepted for publication are not returned to the author and are not stored in the editorial office, but are destroyed.

11. The time frame for consideration of articles submitted for publication is no more than 3 months.

12. The Editor-in-Chief of the journal submits reviews of the manuscripts of articles to the specified addresses at the request of the authors of the articles and the Ministry of Science and Higher Education of the Russian Federation.