

COMPARATIVE PROFESSIONAL PEDAGOGY

GUIDELINES FOR REVIEWING MANUSCRIPTS SUBMITTED TO “COMPARATIVE PROFESSIONAL PEDAGOGY” SCIENTIFIC JOURNAL

1. These guidelines outline the procedure of reviewing manuscripts submitted to the editorial board of “Comparative Professional Pedagogy” scientific journal.
2. The aim of reviewing is to improve the quality of papers published in the Journal by means of their evaluation by competent experts.
3. The procedure of reviewing is anonymous for the reviewer as well as the authors and is performed by two independent reviewers (double-blind peer reviewing).
4. All reviewers must be objective and unbiased and follow the requirements of Publication Ethics.
5. The review must expose whether: the content of the manuscript corresponds to the topic presented in the title and to the scientific scope of the journal; the paper has some novelty and corresponds to the scientific rank of the Journal; the publication of the paper is relevant with consideration of its topicality and being interesting to scientists in the respective field or related fields of pedagogics; the paper has positive features or drawbacks that must be indicated; there should be made some improvements and revision by the author(s).
6. Only papers which correspond to all the author guidelines outlined by the Editorial Board or those which have primarily been checked by the Editorial Board are eligible to undergo the reviewing procedure.
7. In case of critical notes made by the Board at the primary stage of checking the manuscript, it may be returned to the author(s) on the grounds that it does not correspond to the author guidelines.
8. In case of the manuscript correspondence to all the requirements it is submitted to the Executive Secretary.
9. Executive Secretary assigns a registration code to the paper and deletes information about the author(s) from the text.
10. The coded manuscript is sent by e-mail to a member of Editorial Board responsible for the scientific field related to the title of the paper and to an external reviewer.

Ukrainian and foreign Doctors of Sciences who have scientific works related to the subject matter of the paper are engaged in the reviewing process. Such a person gets a letter (e-mail) on behalf of the Editorial Board with the request to review the paper. A coded paper and a standard form of the review are attached to the letter (e-mail). As a

rule, external reviewer is chosen with consideration of his/her current workload and his/her consent.

11. A member of Editorial Board and external reviewer who received the coded manuscript fill in a standard form and choose one of the options of recommendations: recommended for publishing; recommended for revision and improvement; not recommended for publication.

12. In case of rejection of the manuscript or its being recommended for revision and improvement the reviewer or a member of the Editorial Board must provide a written substantiation of such a decision.

13. The recommendations must be formulated during two weeks from the moment of the manuscript being received by the reviewer.

14. The recommendations of the reviewers are sent to the Executive Secretary by e-mail.

15. The final decision concerning the paper is made at the Editorial Board meeting that is held once a week with the participation of Editor-in-Chief, Deputy Editor-in-Chief, Executive Secretary and Technical Secretary. The decision is made with the account of the received reviews.

16. Further work with the manuscript that is accepted for publication is carried out by the Editorial Board staff in accordance with the technical procedure of the Journal issue preparation.

17. The author(s) of the manuscript is(are) informed about the decision of the Editorial Board. Papers that are to be revised and improved are sent to the author(s) with the text of the review that contains definite recommendations as to the revision and improvement of the paper. Anonymity of the reviewers is guaranteed by the Editorial Board of the Journal.

18. The revised version of the paper is subjected to second reviewing. In case of the second negative conclusion of the reviewer, the manuscript is rejected and in future is not eligible for further consideration.

19. The Editorial Board does not discuss the manuscript with the author(s) of the rejected papers.

20. Electronic copies of reviews and recommendations for every manuscript are kept at the Editorial Board during two years from the moment the Journal, in which the reviewed paper is published, is released.

21. Papers whose author(s) is(are) members of the Editorial Board and papers written specifically on request of the Editorial Board are not subjected to the reviewing procedure.