

**On Peer Review of Materials Submitted
to *Vestnik of St. Petersburg University*.
Series 9. Philology. Asian Studies. Journalism**

All materials submitted to *Vestnik of SPbU. Series 9. Philology. Asian Studies. Journalism* (hereinafter referred to as *Vestnik of SPbU*) shall be registered with the secretary of the journal with the received date being stated on the paper. No later than 90 days from this date will the author be informed about one of the following decisions made concerning his/her manuscript: accept outright (specifying the publication date) / request a revision / reject outright and inform authors to revise the manuscript. Should the decision after review not be made within 90 days from the received date, a notice shall be sent to authors explaining the reasons for delay.

Once submitted, all materials (research papers, research notes, review articles, book reviews, etc.) will be assigned to Editor-in-Chief of the *Vestnik of SPbU*, who will read the paper and decide whether it falls within the scope of the journal and meets the following criteria:

1. manuscript should comply with the general requirements for scientific publication; manuscript's title should reflect its content clearly;
2. manuscript should not extend beyond the imposed limits on length, should be appropriately structured and contain all due references;
3. manuscript should include keywords and abstract in Russian and English;
4. manuscript should include contact information for all of its authors as well as their explicit consent for publication in the *Vestnik of SPbU*;
5. manuscript should not contain unattributed reproduction or appropriation of material, plagiarism.

The initial assessment as a rule does not take more than 15 days from the received date. Should the article be rejected after initial assessment, a notice will be sent to authors in writing.

The materials accepted after initial assessment will be peer reviewed by at least two independent experts, who have had scientific publications within the same field of research during the last 3 years. During the review process, the articles may undergo an additional revision or be re-revised by either the same or new experts, including the cases where authors were invited to submit a revised manuscript, at the discretion of the Editor-in-Chief of the *Vestnik of SPbU*.

Reviewers for the *Vestnik of SPbU* may be any qualified researchers working in the same field of knowledge, including members of the Editorial Board of the journal, with preference given to external members. At least one of the reviewers must not be an employee of the St. Petersburg State University. Reviewer must notify the Editorial Board of possible conflicts of interest (such as shared affiliations, supervisory or co-author relationship, etc.) and, in case there is any, refuse to assess the manuscript. At the submission stage, authors may indicate a limited number of scholars whom they consider improper for reviewing the paper. Excluded scholars must be identified by name.

This journal uses double-blind peer review, which means that both the reviewer and author identities are concealed throughout the review process.

The Editorial Board of the *Vestnik of SPbU* guarantees the confidentiality of the review process of a manuscript with respect to all information involved. Any reviewer must confirm in writing the acceptance of responsibility for keeping undisclosed the reviewed work and its content, as well as whatever facts related to the author he/she will find out. Discussion of a reviewed article

with third parties is not allowed. Before publication, the reviewer is not permitted to use or refer to the material under consideration.

During review process, reviewers will attentively read the manuscript:

1. to assess its content for the novelty of the idea;
2. to assess its content for the scientific value and originality; for the number of appropriate up-to-date publications in the field taken into account;
3. to assess its content for clear and unambiguous style of writing: the results and conclusions should reflect the findings clearly and be easily verified;
4. to assess whether the manuscript meets the language and style requirements;
5. to assess whether the article meets the reference standards.

After review, the reviewer will make one of the following decisions:

1. to accept the manuscript outright;
2. to accept the manuscript, but request a minor revision at author's discretion;
3. to recommend the manuscript for publication, but demand a minor or major revision;
4. to reject the manuscript outright with a right for submission of a revised manuscript;
5. to reject the manuscript outright without a right for submission of a revised manuscript.

Should the reviewers' reports contradict one another, the Editorial Board of *Vestnik of SPbU* acts in accordance with the following:

Review report №1	Review report №2	Final decision
1) To accept the manuscript outright	2) To accept the manuscript, but request a minor revision at author's discretion	2) To accept the manuscript, but request a minor revision at author's discretion
	3) To recommend the manuscript for publication, but demand a minor or major revision	3) To recommend the manuscript for publication, but demand a minor or major revision
	4) To reject the manuscript outright with a right for submission of a revised manuscript	The manuscript is discussed at the Editorial Board's session
	5) To reject the manuscript outright without a right for submission of a revised manuscript	The third reviewer is invited to review the manuscript
2) To accept the manuscript, but request a minor revision at author's discretion	3) To recommend the manuscript for publication, but demand a minor or major revision	3) To recommend the manuscript for publication, but demand a minor or major revision
	4) To reject the manuscript outright with a right for submission of a revised manuscript	The manuscript is discussed at the Editorial Board's session
	5) To reject the manuscript outright without a right for	The third reviewer is invited to review the manuscript

	submission of a revised manuscript	
3) To recommend the manuscript for publication, but demand a minor or major revision	4) To reject the manuscript outright with a right for submission of a revised manuscript	4) To reject the manuscript outright with a right for submission of a revised manuscript
	5) To reject the manuscript outright without a right for submission of a revised manuscript	The third reviewer is invited to review the manuscript
4) To reject the manuscript outright with a right for submission of a revised manuscript	5) To reject the manuscript outright without a right for submission of a revised manuscript	The manuscript is discussed at the Editorial Board's session

Two positive review reports are in themselves not sufficient for the article to be accepted for publication. The final decision always rests with the Editorial Board of the *Vestnik of SPbU*. All authors whose manuscripts are recommended for revision or rejected will be sent consolidated lists of the reviewers' and the Editorial Board's members' specific concerns.

The authors are invited to submit their revised manuscripts only once, with any questions and comments on the review report they would like to add. The revised manuscript submitted after 1 month from the day of the author's reception of the review is considered a new submission and must be reprocessed from the beginning.

Positive and negative review reports are submitted to the publisher of *Vestnik of SPbU* along with the materials for the relevant issue. Hard copies of review reports are kept for a period of five years from the publication date or the date of the decision to reject the manuscript. Upon request, the editorial office of *Vestnik of SPbU* sends duplicates of the reviews to the Russian Ministry of Education and Science.