



**PROVISION**  
**on the procedure for articles manuscripts peer review (expert opinion) process organization, that are sent to the editorial office of the collection of scientific works “Scientific Bulletin of the Odessa National Economic University”**

This Provision determines the procedure for reviewing (expert opinion) of scientific articles, that are received by the editorial office of the collection of scientific works “Scientific Bulletin of the Odessa National Economic University (hereinafter - the collection) of Odessa National Economic University (hereinafter - ONEU). The legal basis for the development of this Provision is an order of Rector of ONEU “On the publication of the collections of scientific works “Scientific Bulletin of the Odessa National Economic University”, No. 38 of 27.02.1998; Laws and regulations of Ukraine: Civil Code of Ukraine, No. 435-IV of 16.01.2003; The Law of Ukraine “On Publishing activity”, No. 318/97-VR of 05.06.1997; The Law of Ukraine “On Printed Mass Media (Press) in Ukraine”, No. 2782 of 16.11.1992; The Law of Ukraine “On Copyright and Related Rights”, No. 3792-XII of 23.12.1993 and international standards of publication ethics (The Committee on Publication Ethics - COPE).

The Provision regulates the legal relationship between the publisher of the collection of scientific works “Scientific Bulletin of the Odessa National Economic University”, its editorial board (experts) and authors in the reviewing (expert opinion) process of articles manuscripts, that come to the publisher.

**I. General part**

1.1. Scientific articles, which have been received to the editorial board office, go through a double-blind peer review procedure while maintaining the anonymity of the author and reviewer.

1.2. The scientific article (hereinafter - the article) is taken into consideration, provided that it meets requirements as to original author’s articles (hereinafter - manuscripts), which placed on the official website of the collection.

1.3. The author of article is responsible for the reliability and accuracy of facts, quotations, proper names, correctness and completeness of the presentation of bibliographic data, no plagiarism.

1.4. The work with a manuscript, which was accepted for publication after review (expert opinion), is carried out by the editorial office according to the technological process of the current collection issue preparation.

**II. The procedure for articles manuscripts peer review (expert opinion) process organizing**

2.1. Reviewing (expert opinion) of articles is carried out by the editorial board, which was approved by the publisher and, if necessary, taking into account the relevant industry specificity of the submitted manuscripts, the editor-in-chief may involve external experts, who hold management positions, have a scientific degree and / or professional experience of at least 5 years. The editorial board includes experts, subject to their formal written consent, which they submit or send by e-mail to the editorial board.

2.2. The scientific article may be accepted for publication only if there is a review (based on the expert opinion), the receipt of which is provided by the publisher.

2.3. For peer review of articles manuscripts, that are received for publication, are enlisted the experts in the economy (or economic sciences) with degree of Doctor of Economics, which during the past five years had publications in international and Ukrainian cited editions on economic problems, that correspond to the

collection subject areas.

2.4. The editor-in-chief (deputy editor-in-chief) after article receiving, determines its relevance to the thematic scope of the publication, typographic requirements, checks for the plagiarism and sends for peer review (expert opinion) to the editorial board member with scientific specialization, which corresponds to the title of the scientific article. In case of article inconsistency with the publication thematic scope and plagiarism detection, the author is informed about the impossibility of its publication, stating the reason.

2.5. In the review of the corresponding manuscript of the scientific article, the reviewer (expert) is obliged to specify: the title of the scientific article; compliance of the scientific article with the thematic scope of the publication; article structure (division by section); clarity of the aim and objectives; adherence to the structure and scope of the abstract, conciseness and accuracy of formulations, clarity of description of the originality, practical and (or) theoretical value of the findings; sufficiency of disclosure of the essence of the research in the structural elements of the scientific article "Formulation of the problem in general" and "Conclusions and prospects for further development in this direction" whether sufficient attention has been paid to the object of the research and analysis of existing solutions to problems / basic ideas, or to the highlighted and well-explained aspects of the common problem that have not been solved previously; findings, practical and (or) theoretical value of the research findings; use of scientific research methods; reliability and validity of conclusions; persuasiveness and appropriateness of the use of auxiliary materials (tables, figures); use of authoritative literary sources indexed in recognized scientometric databases (not older than 5 years); variety of vocabulary and grammatical construction of the language; comments and specific recommendations for revising, reducing or extending the material of the scientific article (recommended changes); conclusions (final decision, comments of the reviewer) on the possibility of publication of the peer-reviewed article in the collection of scientific works "Scientific Bulletin of the Odessa National Economic University" or its rejection.

The review (expert opinion) form is given in Appendix 1 to this Provision.

2.6. The originals of the reviews should only have of the reviewer signature and reviewing date, which envisage preserves the reviewer anonymity.

2.7. The peer review (expert opinion) results in paper or scanned electronic form are submitted to the editorial office of the collection within the set time limits. Peer review (expert opinion) periods in each individual case are determined with a creating the conditions for the most expeditious publication of the article and should not exceed 7 days from the date of the manuscript receipt for review.

2.8. The author of article is given an opportunity to read the peer review (expert opinion) conclusions. The identity of the reviewer (expert) may be disclosed to the author exclusively in cases stipulated by the current legislation on the basis of relevant judicial decision.

2.9. According to the peer review (expert opinion) results, reviewers (experts) can:

- recommend the article for publication (the final decision "Accept");
- recommend the article for publication after its revision based on the comments (the final decision "Revise");
- reject the article (the final decision "Reject"). If the reviewer (expert) rejects the article, than the reasons for such decision should be given in his conclusions.

2.10. If according the reviewer (an expert) conclusions the manuscript needs additions and refinements, the editorial office sends such article by e-mail for author's correcting. Corrected article must be returned to the editorial office within a period not exceeding 7 days after receiving a peer review results from the editorial office.

2.11. The manuscript of article, which is received after revision, together with the author's reply is sent to the reviewer (expert) for reading and supplementary evaluation. The reviewer (expert) must submit to the editorial office the repeated results of peer review, at the time set by the editor in chief or executive editor, and editorial board decides on accepting the articles for publication or its rejecting.

2.12. If there is a substantial share of expert's critical remark on the article and a general positive recommendation, the editorial board can refer the material to polemical one and print it for scientific discussion.

2.13. When receiving by the editorial office of collection a positive (or negative) reviews (expert opinions) about an article, one of the members of the editorial board and / or the deputy editor-in-chief becomes acquainted with them, and then he presents this article together with the expert opinions at its meeting.

2.14. The final decision about expediency of article publishing after peer review (expert opinion) is made by the editor-in-chief, and, where necessary and the existence of conflicting conclusions - collegially, i.e.

by the editorial board. The opinion of editorial board of the collection about possibility of the article publishing or its rejection can be made in writing at the end of the review.

2.15. The editorial board of the collection, based on a decision made by the editorial board, sends a letter to the author (s) by email that provides a general evaluation of the article and the and informed about an accepted decision. When rejecting an article with a collegial decision of the editorial board, the editorial office sends to the authors a message: «Your article was rejected by the editorial board decision» with a brief justification.

2.16. If the author of article disagrees with the reviewers (experts) opinion, he has a right to submit a reasoned answer to the editorial office of the collection and to contact the editor-in-chief, who can send the article for additional agreement to the editorial board.

2.17. Minor corrections to the spelling or stylistic nature are made by the editorial office staff without the author's agreement.

2.18. The original of reviews, which certified by the reviewers (experts) signatures, is kept by editorial office for three years.

### **III. Final part**

3.1. The provision shall enter into force upon signature and are valid during the whole period of preparation and publication of the collection of scientific works «Scientific Bulletin of the Odessa National Economic University».

3.2. The necessary editorial changes and amendments to this Provision may be formulated as a new document or as an appendix to existing document and must be approved at the editorial board meeting.

Appendix 1  
the Provision on the procedure for articles manuscripts peer review (expert opinion) process organization, received by editorial office of the collection of scientific works «Scientific Bulletin of the Odessa National Economic University»

**REVIEW**  
**(expert opinion)**  
**to the scientific article submitted for publication in the collection of scientific works**  
**«Scientific Bulletin of the Odessa National Economic University»**

Title of the article				
CRITERIA	EXCELLENT	GOOD	NOT GOOD	COMMENTS
Compliance with the thematic scope of the publication				
Structure of the scientific article (division by sections)				
Clear formulation of the aim and objectives				
Compliance with structure and scope of the abstract, conciseness and accuracy of formulations, clarity of description of the originality, practical and (or) theoretical value of the findings				
“Formulation of the problem in general” and “Conclusions and prospects for further development in this direction” reveal the essence of the research				
Sufficient attention is paid to the object of the research and analysis of existing solutions to problems / basic ideas, highlighted and well-explained unresolved aspects of a common problem				
The findings are originality				
The findings are of practical and (or) theoretical value				
The use of scientific research methods				
The conclusions are reliable and substantiated				
The supporting materials (tables, figures) are convincing and relevant				
The use of authoritative references indexed in recognized scientometric databases (not older than 5 years)				
A variety of vocabulary and grammatical construction of the language				
<b>CHANGES RECOMMENDED</b>				
Please, leave comments and specific recommendations for revising, reducing or extending the material of the scientific article				
<b>The final</b>	<b>Accept</b>	<b>Revise</b>	<b>Reject</b>	

<b>decision</b>			
<b>REVIEWER'S COMMENTS</b>			
Please, leave a final opinion on the scientific article reviewed			
Reviewer's signature, date			