

PROVISION
on the procedure of reviewing and accepting the articles submitted to the
international scientific journal
"Land reclamation and water management"

I. General provisions.

1.1 This provision regulates the procedure of reviewing and accepting the articles submitted to the interdepartmental thematic scientific collection "Land Reclamation and Water Management" (hereinafter - the Journal).

1.2 The purpose of reviewing is to improve the quality of scientific papers that are published in the Journal, via objective and impartial evaluations provided by qualified experts in the field of scientific work.

II The procedure for reviewing and accepting the articles

2.1 Articles are reviewed in accordance with the procedure established by this provision.

At the first stage, manuscripts are considered by the editorial to assess their relevance to the subject matter and requirements of the Journal as well as to check plagiarism.

Only papers drawn up in accordance with the manual for the authors and in the absence of plagiarism are allowed to be reviewed.

.The manual for the authors can be found here:
https://mivg.iwpim.com.ua/index.php/mivg/submissions#Authors_Guidelines

Within 7 calendar days the editorial informs authors about the acceptance and referral of the article for reviewing or its rejection.

2.2 At the second stage, the manuscripts are submitted for double-blind reviewing : a procedure when neither an author nor reviewers know each other.

2.3 The editor provides the article with a registration code and deletes the information about the author (s) from it (the procedure of article coding).

Then the manuscript is sent by e-mail to:

- a) a member of the editorial board responsible for the scientific area in accordance with the theme of the article;
- b) an external reviewer.

Domestic or foreign doctors of science who are specialists in the relevant area, carry out research in it and have at least one publication for the last three years in the periodicals included in the List of scientific professional publications of Ukraine or foreign publications included in the Web of Science Core Collection and/or Scopus, or have monographs or parts of monographs published by International Publishers in A, B, or C categories under the Research School for Socio-Economic and Natural Sciences of the Environment (SENSE) can be the reviewers of the papers.

2.4 The editor sends such a scientist a letter requesting for a review of the submitted article. If the scientist confirms his readiness to review it, then he is sent the manuscript of the encoded article and the standard form of the review (Annex).

2.5 The review procedure includes verifying the title of the article to its content, the presence of scientific novelty, relevance, completeness of papers, methods and results of the study, the validity of the conclusions and lasts up to 14 calendar days.

2.6 The reviewers fill in the standard form (Annex) and choose one of the recommendation options - to accept as submitted, accept with some technical corrections, to accept after refinement, to reject.

2.7 If there are any reviewer's comments, they must be taken into account and after refinement the corrected manuscript should be sent again to the editorial.

If there are no comments of the reviewers, or they have already been corrected by the author in accordance with the recommendations, the article is sent for editing. The deadline for making corrections is up to 14 days. The corrected article is resent to the reviewer for approval.

Articles given the review's recommendation "reject the publication" are not accepted for reconsideration. A negative review is sent to authors by e-mail.

2.8 The editorial board reserves the right to conduct an additional review.

2.9. Reviews, signed by the reviewer by ordinary or digital electronic signature, must be kept in the editorial office for at least three years.

2.10 The decision on whether or not a manuscript should be published is made at the meeting of the editorial board. Decisions are made taking into account the received reviews.

2.11 Further work with the manuscript, accepted for publication, is carried out by the editorial staff in accordance with the procedure of the Journal's issue publishing.

III Principles of professional ethics for reviewers

The reviewer carries out a scientific examination of the author's materials, as a result of which his actions should be impartial, consisting of the following principles:

- the manuscript received for the review must be regarded as a confidential document that can not be communicated to the third parties who are not authorized by the editorial board for the review or discussion;

The reviewer carries out a scientific examination of the author's materials, as a result of which his actions should be impartial, consisting in the following principles:

- the manuscript received for review must be regarded as a confidential document that can not be communicated to the third parties who are not authorized by the editorial board for review or discussion;

- the reviewer is obliged to give an objective and reasoned assessment of the results of the study;

- unpublished data obtained from manuscripts submitted for the consideration should not be used by the reviewer for personal purposes;

- a reviewer who does not possess, in his opinion, sufficient qualifications to evaluate the manuscript, or can not be objective, for example in the case of a conflict of interest, must notify the editorial board with a request to exclude him from the process of reviewing the manuscript of the article.

Chief Editor –



M. ROMASHCHENKO

Deputy Chief Editor



A. SHATKOVSKY

Institute of Water Problems and Land Reclamation

National Academy of Agrarian Sciences of Ukraine

03022, 37, Vasylykivska Str., Kyiv, Ukraine,

tel .: + 38044-257-40-30, fax: + 38044-257-40-01

e-mail: journal.iwpim@gmail.com Web site: <http://mivg.iwpim.com.ua/index.php/mivg/about>

REVIEW

For the article

Registration №: _____

submitted for the publication in the interdepartmental thematic scientific collection "Land reclamation and water management".

1. Does the article correspond to the subject matter of the collection?

If so, which heading should it be included in?

Title of the heading –

☐ yes ☐ partly ☐ no

2. Is the structure of the article consistent with the requirements of the collection?

☐ yes ☐ partly ☐ no

3. Is the volume of the article consistent with the requirements of the collection?

☐ yes ☐ partly ☐ no

4. Is the author (s) sufficiently present(s) the research results of other scholars on the subject of the article?

☐ yes ☐ partly ☐ no

5. Does the title match the article's contents?

☐ yes ☐ partly ☐ no

6. Does the article contain new scientific results (novelty)?

☐ yes ☐ partly ☐ no

7. Is the article material a summary of the completed studies (research phase)?

☐ yes ☐ partly ☐ no

8. Are the findings consistent with the purpose, objectives and results presented?

☐ yes ☐ partly ☐ no

9. Does the abstract in English correspond to the requirements for the publications included in the scientometric databases?

☐ yes

☐ partly

☐ no

10. Is the bibliography (references) made in accordance with the requirements?

☐ yes

☐ partly

☐ no

Other comments and wishes: _____

Recommendations of the editorial board regarding the acceptance of the manuscript of the article:

☐ **Accept as submitted;**

☐ **Accept with technical corrections;**

☐ **Accept after refinement;**

☐ **Reject**

«___» _____ 20___ p.