

**Peer Review Policy for scientific articles,
which are published in the collection of scientific works
Problems of a Modern Textbook**

«Проблеми сучасного підручника»

(approved at the meeting of the editorial board of the scientific edition Minutes No. 1,
dated February 19, 2014)

The collection of scientific works *Problems of a Modern Textbook* («Проблеми сучасного підручника») is a professional periodical publication of the Institute of Pedagogy of the National Academy of Educational Sciences of Ukraine, which was founded in 2002 and re-registered in 2014 as a periodical (Certificate of the state registration of the printed mass media: a series of KV № 20775-10575 PR from 13.06. 2014) and professional edition (Order of the Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine dated January 17, 2014, No. 41 (as amended on September 29, 2014, Order No. 1081), pedagogical sciences).

Author's manuscripts of articles that are sent to the editorial board (except for reviews, review articles and informational messages) come to the obligatory peer review process. The purpose of the review is to ensure the quality of the materials printed in the scientific collection of works by independent professional evaluation of the content of an article and its conformity with national and international parameters of the quality of scientific products, which contributes to the positive image and popularity of the edition within scientific circles.

The peer review procedure involves a comprehensive analysis of the material of an article, an objective assessment of its content, structure and style of writing, determining the relevance of an article to the requirements for articles in the scientific collection of works *Problems of a Modern Textbook* («Проблеми сучасного підручника»). Only those articles that have a scientific value and contribute to solving actual problems of pedagogical science and practice are accepted for publishing.

Two independent experts are involved in the peer reviewing of the article who submit their inferences in a written form. The review procedure is anonymous for both the reviewer and the authors. Reviewers are informed that manuscripts are the intellectual property of the authors and belong to the information that is not a subject to disclosure. Reviewers are not allowed to make copies of the article submitted for review or to use the materials of the article prior to its publication. The review is based on confidentiality, when information about the article (terms of receipt, content, stages, and peculiarities of the review, remarks and suggestions of reviewers and the final publication decision) are not informed to anyone other than authors and reviewers. Breaking this requirement is possible only if there are signs or statements

regarding the unreliability or falsification of the materials of the article. By agreement (willing) of authors and reviewers, along with the article, remarks of reviewers may be published. The author of the article manuscript is given the opportunity to observe the text of the review, in particular if he does not agree with the conclusions of the reviewer.

MANUSCRIPTS PEER REVIEW PROCEDURE

1. The author submits an article to the editorial board, which should meet the requirements for the articles in the scientific edition *Problems of a Modern Textbook* («Проблеми сучасного підручника») and the general rules for preparation of scientific works for publication. Manuscripts that do not meet the requirements are not registered and not allowed for further consideration.

2. The author's manuscripts, coming to the editorial board, are initially evaluated by the responsible secretary for the presence of all structural elements: annotations, information about the author, reviews (for authors who do not have a scientific degree), proper volume of the manuscript and sent to two reviewers according to the profile of the study. Reviewers are appointed by the editor-in-chief of the edition or, according to his decision (in certain circumstances), the appointment of reviewers may be reassigned to a member of the editorial board. In some cases, the issue of the choice of reviewers is decided at a meeting of the editorial board. According to the decision of the editor-in-chief of the journal, certain articles of prominent scholars, as well as specially invited articles, may be exempted from the standard peer review procedure.

3. For peer reviewing of articles members of the editorial board of the scientific edition *Problems of a Modern Textbook* («Проблеми сучасного підручника»), as well as outside highly skilled specialists who have deep professional knowledge and work experience in a specific scientific field (as a rule, doctors of sciences, professors) can act as reviewers.

4. After receiving the article for peer reviewing (within 10 days), the reviewer evaluates the manuscript of the article. The reviewing periods may vary in each case, taking into account creation of the conditions for the most objective evaluation of the quality of the materials provided. In the case of any competing interests between the reviewer and the author, the reviewer must refuse to review and inform the editorial board, which assigns another reviewer.

5. The reviewer gives a conclusion on the possibility / impossibility of placing an article in the scientific collection of works or on the need for revision and placement in the next issue.

6. The review is conducted confidentially on the principles of double-blind review (neither the author nor the reviewer knows about each other). Interaction between the

author and reviewers is carried out through the responsible secretary of the edition by correspondence by e-mail. At the request of the reviewer and in agreement with the working group of the editorial board, the interaction between the author and the reviewer can take place in an open mode (such a decision is made only if the openness of the interaction will improve the style and logic of the presentation of the research material).

7. For all articles submitted for review, the degree of uniqueness of the author's text is determined by means of the appropriate software.

8. After final analysis of the article, the reviewer fills in the standardized form (Appendix 1), which provides recommendations for improving the materials of the article. In the process of developing a review form, generally accepted recommendations on the sequence and organization of the review process are used. The editorial board informs the author of the results of the review by e-mail.

9. If the reviewer indicates the necessity of making certain corrections to the article, the article is sent to the author with the suggestion to take into account the remarks or to argue to refute them. After correcting and finishing the article, the author sends it together with a letter in which he substantiates his decision to accept or refuse the recommendations of the reviewers and explains all the changes that were made in the text. The corrected version of the article is re-submitted to the reviewer for making a decision and preparing a conclusion on the possibility of publication. The date of acceptance of an article for publication is the date of receipt by the editorial staff of a positive opinion of the reviewer (or the decision of the editorial board) regarding the expediency and the possibility of publishing the article.

10. In case of disagreement with the opinion of the reviewer, the author of the article can give a reasoned answer to the editorial office of the journal. In this case, the article is considered at the meeting of the working group of the editorial board. The editorial board may send the article for additional review to another specialist. The editorial board reserves the right to reject the articles in case of incapability or unwillingness of the author to take into account the wishes and remarks of reviewers. At the request of the reviewer, the editorial board may submit the article to another reviewer, with the obligatory adherence to the principles of double-blind review.

11. The final decision on the possibility and expediency of publication is made by the editor-in-chief (or, on his behalf, by a member of the editorial board), and, if necessary, by the meeting of the editorial board as a whole. After deciding to allow the article to be published, the chief secretary informs the author thereof and indicates the expected publication period.

12. In case of a positive decision on the possibility of publishing the article, the responsible secretary attaches it to the content of the next issue of the scientific collection of works *Problems of a Modern Textbook* («Проблеми сучасного підручника»), which is approved at the meeting of the Academic Council of the

Institute of Pedagogy of the National Academy of Educational Sciences of Ukraine, whereupon a proper note is made on the second page of the issue.

13. The article approved for publication is examined by the technical editor. Insignificant corrections of a stylistic or formal type that do not affect the content of the article are made by the technical editor without the consent of the author. If necessary or at the author's request, the manuscript in the form of an article layout is returned to the author for approval.

14. The author and reviewer are responsible for the reliability of the introduced facts and data, the validity of the conclusions of the research and recommendations, the scientific and practical level of the articles.

PEER REVIEW FORM

Name of the article _____

First name, last name of the reviewer _____

Date of receiving the article for peer review _____

1. The content of the article corresponds to the topic (profile) of the journal

Yes No

2. The title of the article corresponds to the content of the material and its purpose:

Yes No

Suggestions for the title:

3. Remarks on annotations:

- no remarks
- need to be expanded
- need to be shortened
- the content of the annotation does not correspond to the content of the research
- clarify the content (see a comment)

Keywords are adequate to the article (up to 5 words)

Yes No

Comments: _____

4. The manuscript does not include the following structural components:

- formulation of the problem
- analysis of recent researches and publications
- aim of the article
- conclusions
- all structural elements are available

5. Actuality of the research is substantiated

- to a sufficient degree not enough

6. Novelty of the material outlined

- available absent

7. Remarks on analysis of sources and publications:

- no remarks
- no references to some sources
- some sources do not match the content of the research
- need to be refined

Comments: _____

8. Remarks on the aim of the article:

- no remarks
- needs clarification
- does not correspond to the content of the material

9. Is scientific argumentation in the content of the article is logical and convincing?

- Yes No

Are results of the study methodologically correctly presented?

- Yes No

Comments _____

10. Conclusions

- no remarks
- do not correspond to the structure of the article
- insufficiently substantiated

11. Recommendations for the editorial board (tick)

- Accept an article - the article is ready for publication and is accepted without changes
- It is necessary to make corrections - it is accepted, if the author will take into account the given remarks
- Return to re-review - revision and re-reviewing of the article is necessary
- To send to another edition - because the subject of the article reveals another direction of research and does not correspond to thematic sections of the Journal
- Reject an article - an article does not meet the requirements for the publication, contains plagiarism or other reason indicated by the reviewer.

Additional comments and suggestions to the author

Signature of the reviewer _____

Date of submission of the review to the editorial office _____