



Rules for Review of the Articles Submitted for Publication to the Journal «Universities for Tourism and Service Association Bulletin»

All articles submitted to the editorial office undergo an independent bilateral anonymous review.

The Editor of Science shall forward the article to one or, if it is necessary, to two reviewers.

The members of the editorial Board of the journal “Universities for Tourism and Service Association Bulletin” and highly qualified scientists of the University can be invited to review manuscripts as well as experts from other organizations and universities with deep professional knowledge and experience in particular scientific area. They are mostly candidates of sciences*, associate professors, doctors of sciences**, professors with publications on the subject of the reviewed article which are not older than three years.

Remuneration of reviewers, except for the Members of the Editorial Board, shall be settled in compliance with the regulations in effect.

Reviewers are informed that the manuscripts sent to them are private property constituting confidential information with restrictions for disclosure imposed on them. Reviewers are prohibited from making any copies of the articles for their personal use. Common rules of confidentiality are observed while reviewing the articles. Confidentiality requirement may be breached only in case when the reviewer states that the materials used in the article are unreliable or false.

The authors receive copies of reviews or reasoned rejections. The originals are stored at the editorial office within five years from the date of publication and can be requested by expert councils of the Higher Attestation Commission*** and the Ministry of education and science of the Russian Federation.

If the review has some remarks for corrections of the article, the article is returned to the author for a rework. In this case the date of submission is considered the date when the revised article is resubmitted.

An article returned to the author for a rework should be corrected and resubmitted within a month. It should be accompanied with a letter from the author(s), providing comments to all the remarks and explanations of any amendments made to the article.

If the article was subjected to considerable changes by the author, following the advice of the reviewer, it should be resubmitted to the same reviewer who made critical remarks.

The Editorial Office preserves the right to reject resubmitted articles if the author is unable or reluctant to address the Editorial Board’s comments.

If there are two negative reviews of the article submitted by two different reviewers, or if there is one negative review of its updated version, the article is rejected without consideration by other Members of the Editorial Board.

If the author is dissatisfied with the opinion of the reviewer, he has the right to submit a reasoned appeal to the journal’s Editorial Office. The article might be forwarded for a re-review or for the approval to the Editorial Board.

A decision on the publication feasibility of the article after its review is elaborated by the Editor-in-Chief and, if it is necessary, by the Editorial Board.

The Editor of Science informs the author on the made decision.

Requirements for a Scientific Article Review

The objective of a review is to assure that only the best authors’ manuscripts are released for publication and to provide specific recommendations aiming at the manuscripts improvement. A review should represent an unbiased assessment of a scientific article and contain a comprehensive analysis of the article’s scientific and methodological merits and drawbacks.

Requirements for the Content of a Scientific Article Review

The reviewer should:

Verify that the content of the article corresponds to the journal’s theme.

Assess the relevance of the article's content and confirm that the science and technology references used in the article are in line with the latest developments in this field.

Assess the significance of the research results (both scientific and practical).

State how well the author addresses the style and formatting requirements. i.e the length of the article, presence of an abstract and list of keywords and references in the text.

Conduct qualitative and/or quantitative assessment of the data contained in the article, including:

– Actual data;

– Illustrative material.

Assess completeness and accuracy of the provided data.

Assess correctness and precision of the used (or cited) definitions and wordings.

Assess literary style of the presented material.

Provide justified conclusions on the article as a whole, remarks and, if necessary, recommendations for its improvement.

All the issues referred to hereinabove are of a general nature. The criteria for assessment of each particular article are selected on individual basis.

The conclusion section of a review should contain a distinctive recommendation on whether the article can be published "as is", or whether it requires a reworking (in the latter case constructive remarks should be provided) or whether it is impractical to publish it in the journal).

* Candidate of Science – The Russian Candidate of Science degree is the analogue of the Doctor of Philosophy degree (Ph.D.), which exists in many countries of the world

** Doctor of Science – The Russian Doctor of Science degree is the highest research degree in this country. Many scientists having that degree are professors.

*** Higher Attestation Commission is a name of a national government agency in Russia that oversees awarding of advanced academic degrees.

[Download the form of the review](#)