

PROVISIONS ON PEER REVIEWING PROCESS

1. GENERAL PROVISIONS

The peer reviewing procedure is applied for all articles submitted to the editorial board. The aim of the peer reviewing is to contribute to the strict selection of authors' manuscripts for their publishing and introduction of specific recommendations regarding their improvement. The peer reviewing procedure is used for the maximum objective evaluation of the content of a research article, determination of their compliance with journal requirements, and supposes detailed analysis of merits and shortcomings of the materials presented in the article. Only those articles are accepted for publishing, which are valuable from the scientific point of view and contribute to solution of relevant problems and tasks. Separately, we consider the level of compliance with requirements for article preparation for publishing in a scientific journal (see Instructions for authors).

The main purpose of the review procedure is to eliminate cases of poor scientific research practices and to ensure coordination and balance between the interests of authors, readers, the editorial board, reviewers, and the institution where the research was conducted. The number and type of manuscripts submitted for review, the number of reviewers, the review procedure, and the consideration of reviewers' comments may vary.

The peer reviewing process of manuscripts is confidential. When submitting a manuscript for the peer review, authors trust editors with the results of their scientific work and creative efforts, which their reputation and career can depend on. Disclosure of confidential details of the manuscript reviewing infringes the authors' rights. The editors do not provide information regarding the manuscript (including the information on its obtainment, content, reviewing process, critical remarks of reviewers, and final conclusion) to anybody except the authors themselves and reviewers. Breach of confidentiality is possible only in the case of a claim on unreliability or falsification of materials; its observance is mandatory in all other cases.

2. PEER REVIEWING PROCESS

1. The author provides an article to the editorial board; the article should meet the requirements of the policy of the journal and the rules of the preparation of articles and scientific papers before publication. Manuscripts that do not meet the adopted requirements are not registered and not accepted for further consideration, and author should be informed about this. The manuscript is registered by the executive secretary in the article registration log with indication of the date of its receipt, title, full author/s' name, author/s' place of work. The manuscript is assigned with an individual registration number.
2. The executive secretary carries out a preliminary evaluation of the manuscripts submitted to the editorial office for compliance with the journal's policy, requirements, and rubrics, as well as a plagiarism check.
3. All manuscripts submitted to the editorial board undergo independent double-blind peer review for their critical evaluation by external experts who are not members of the editorial board. Based on the results of this review, submitted in the defined form, the editorial board decides on the advisability and timing of issuing the article, as well as on the possible need for its revision.
4. Independent peer review is conducted by external leading specialists who are not members of the editorial board and have deep professional knowledge and experience in a specific scientific field, as a rule, Doctor of Science or Professors.
5. After receiving an article for review (within 5 days), the reviewer evaluates the possibility of reviewing materials based on his own skills under the direction of the author's research area and the absence of any conflict of interest. If there are any conflict of interests, the reviewer should not review the article and should inform the editorial board about this. The latter should decide to appoint another reviewer.

6. The reviewer usually takes the decision on the possibility of publishing the paper within 14 days. Period of the reviewing may change in each case subject considering the creation of conditions for the most objective evaluation of quality of provided materials but will not exceed 1 calendar month.
7. Reviewing is held in confidence by the principles of double-blind reviewing, when neither the author nor the reviewer knows each other. The interaction between author and reviewers occurs in a way of correspondence by e-mail through the executive secretary of the journal. At the request of the reviewer and in agreement with the working group, an interaction between the editorial board and reviewer can occur in an open mode (such a decision is made only if the interaction of openness will improve the style and presentation logic of the research material).
8. For all articles submitted for reviewing, the degree of uniqueness of the author's text is determined using appropriate software, which shows the uniqueness level, sources, and the degree of similarity of the text ("StrikePlagiarism").
9. After the final analysis of the article, the reviewer fills out a standardized form (review form), which contains a summary of recommendations. Editors notify the author about the results of reviewing by e-mail.
10. If the reviewer points to the need to make certain corrections to the articles, the article will be sent to the author with the offer to consider the comments in the preparation of an updated version of the article or to refute them reasonably. Into a revised article, the author adds the letter, which contains answers to all comments and explains all the changes made in the article. The revised version is given to the reviewer again for the decision and prepare a reasoned conclusion about the possibility of publication. The date of the article's publication is the date of receipt of a positive conclusion of the reviewer (or the decision of the editorial board) by editorial office regarding the advisability and possibility of publishing an article.
11. In case of disagreement with the reviewer's opinion, the author is entitled to a reasonable response to the editor of the journal. In such a case, the article will be considered at a meeting of the working group of the editorial board. Editors may submit an article for additional or new review to another expert. The editorial board reserves the right to reject the articles in the case of an impossibility or unwillingness of the author to take into account the reviewer's suggestions and comments. At the request of the editorial board, the reviewer can give the manuscript to another reviewer with mandatory compliance with the principles of double-blind review.
12. The final decision on the possibility and advisability of the publication will be taken by the Editor-in-Chief (or on his behalf - a member of the editorial board), and if necessary during meeting of the editorial board. After deciding on the admission of articles for publication, the executive secretary shall notify the author and indicate the expected date of publication.
13. If a positive decision on the possibility of publication is received, the manuscript comes to the editorial portfolio for its publication in the order of turn and relevance (in some cases, by the decision of the Editor-in-Chief, the article may be published out of turn, in the nearest issue).
14. The final decision about the content of the printed articles is recorded in the protocol of the meeting of the Scientific and Technical Council of the Kharkiv National University of Radio Electronics, which is noted on the second page of the journal cover.
15. The article approved for publication will be given to the technical editor. Minor stylistic or formal corrections, which do not affect the content of the article will be made by the technical editor without the consent of the author. All manuscripts in the form of a layout are returned to the author for approval.
16. Responsibility for copyright infringement and for failure of existing standards in article's materials relies on the author. The responsibility for the accuracy of the above facts and data, the validity of findings, recommendations and scientific and practical level of article relies on both the author and reviewer.

3. REVIEWER'S RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Reviewers give a review on a manuscript, which contains a conclusion on the possibility of publishing the article.

If the reviewer recommends the article for publishing after an additional revision taking into account remarks or does not recommend the article for publishing, the reasons for such a decision should be indicated in the review.

The reviewer should review the received manuscript within the period agreed with the executive secretary and send the motivated refusal from the reviewing or the review to the editorial board (by email).

The reviewers evaluate theoretical and methodological level of the manuscript, its practical value, and scientific value. Besides, the reviewers determine the compliance of the paper with ethics principles in scientific publications and give recommendations regarding elimination of cases of their violation.

The reviewers are informed that the manuscripts sent to them are intellectual property of authors and are the information, which cannot be disclosed.

The reviewers are not allowed copying the manuscript given to them for reviewing or using the information on the paper content before its being published.

Reviewing is performed confidentially, when the information on the article (dates of its receipt, content, stages and peculiarities of the reviewing process, reviewer's remarks, and final decision regarding acceptance) is not communicated to anybody except the authors and reviewers. Violation of this requirement is possible only in the case of the presence of signs or a claim on unreliability or falsification of materials of the article.

4. AUTHOR'S RIGHT AND RESPONSIBILITIES

The author of a reviewed paper has an opportunity to read the review text, in particular if he/she does not agree with the reviewer's conclusions.

If the case of a disagreement with reviewer's opinion, the author of the article has a right to give a reasoned answer to the editorial board of the journal. The article can be submitted for the repeated reviewing or for an agreement by the editorial board.

The articles sent to authors for corrections have to be returned to the editorial board not later than 2 weeks after their receipt. If the article is returned later, the date of its publishing will be changed respectively.

The executive secretary informs the author on the dates of publishing his/her article within no more than one month after the date of the receipt of positive conclusion regarding the publishing his/her article.

*** WHY TO SUBMIT ARTICLES IN JOURNALS WITH AN ANONYMOUS PROCEDURE OF REVIEWING AND ARTICLE SELECTIONS?**

Firstly, as a scientist and researcher, you seek to share the results of your studies with scientific circles, where scientists with an international reputation play an important role. When obtaining an access to international community, you can develop ties outside your country, deepen your specialization, contribute to development of your research as well as increase your personal status. However, the access to international circles supposes knowledge and compliance with international standards, which in particular include an anonymous process of peer reviewing and article selection.

Secondly, publication of articles in journals, which have an anonymous process of peer reviewing and article selection, aids in professional activity. It is clear that the career growth has its peculiarities in different countries. However, the researcher who seek to be recognized abroad has to know professional growth criteria used in other countries. One of such criteria is publications in journals with anonymous section of articles. Such publications are considered the measure of the status and confidence to you as a scientist and thus they define the possibility of your career growth. Thus, publications in such journals are necessary for an international career, otherwise your professional possibilities will be relatively limited.

Finally, an anonymous process of peer reviewing and article selection is a good way for self-development; it gives a possibility to get knowledge on other studies and developments. Moreover, the revised article give you is an opportunity to improve your own skills of article writing.