

THE REGULATIONS

of the procedure for submitting, reviewing, and publishing scientific articles in the journal "Liberal Arts in Russia"

1. General terms

1.1. The regulations of the peer review of scientific articles specify the manner and procedure of reviewing the author's original text of the articles received by the editors of the journal "Liberal Arts in Russia" (hereinafter – the journal).

1.2. Peer review (expert evaluation) of manuscripts of scientific articles is provided in order to ensure and maintain the high scientific-theoretical level of the journal and to select the most valuable and promising articles.

1.3. Peer review is required for all articles submitted for publication in the journal.

1.4. The following definitions are used in the regulations:

Author is a person or group of persons involved in the writing of article based on the results of scientific research.

Editor-in-chief is a person heading the editorial board and making the final decisions regarding the production and publishing of the journal.

Plagiarism is intentional appropriation of authorship of someone else's works of science or art, ideas or inventions. Plagiarism may include violation of copyright or patent law and as such may lead to legal responsibility.

Editor is a representative of scientific journal or publishing house, who carries out preparation of materials for publication as well as supporting communication with authors and readers of scientific publications.

Editorial Board is an advisory body, a group of eminent persons, which provides assistance to editor-in-chief in evaluation, selection and preparation of works for publication.

Reviewer is an expert acting on behalf of the scientific journal or publishing house and making scientific examination of articles and materials to determine the possibility of their publication.

Peer review is a procedure of examination and expert evaluation of proposed for publishing scientific article by a reviewer for the purpose of determining the appropriateness of its publication and pointing out its strengths and weaknesses, which is important for improvement of the manuscript by the author and the editors.

2. The order of primary consideration of an article

2.1. The editors accept articles and materials that reflect scientific views, results and achievements of fundamental and theoretical-applied studies in the field of humanitarian, socio-economic and social sciences in the following fields: philosophy, philology, literary criticism, art and its history, pedagogy and teaching, psychology, ethics and aesthetics, cultural studies, ethnology, religious studies, history, history and philosophy of science, history and theory of arts, sociology, political science, journalism, law, and economics. Materials that are not relevant to the topics of the listed subject areas are not accepted.

2.2. Articles are accepted for consideration by the editors, if they meet the requirements for the author's articles (materials) posted on the journal's website <http://libartus.com> and in the current issues of the journal.

2.3. Materials can be submitted to the editors by e-mail on address edit@libartrus.com or by uploader on the website.

Initially, three files should be sent to the editors:

- article;
- abstract in English;
- information about the authors in Russian and in English languages.

When the article is registered (accepted to be considered), scanned copies of the following documents should be sent to the editors:

- direction from organization/company (on a form with a “wet” stamp);
- text of the article signed by all authors;
- license agreement signed by the responsible author;

2.4. The submitted material needs to be open. The confidentiality mark serves as a basis for rejection for open publication.

2.5. Notification of authors about receiving the materials is carried out by the editor in 3 days.

2.6. Manuscript of scientific article submitted to the journal is considered by the editor for completeness of the sent documents and for compliance of manuscript (article) with the requirements of the Editorial Board, the journal topics and formal rules. In case of non-compliance with conditions of publication, article can be sent to the author for revision.

2.7. The article that meets the requirements for publication is registered by the editor in the logbook with the date of receipt, title, name and affiliation of author(s) and sent for review.

3. The order and procedure of reviewing manuscripts

3.1. All articles submitted to the journal are subjected to mandatory expert evaluation (peer-reviewed).

3.2. Reviewers are scientists with recognized authority and working in the field of knowledge, which the content of a manuscript is related. All the journal's reviewers have PhD or Doctor of Science degree.

3.3. Reviewers are required to follow the accepted Code of the ethics of scientific publications.

3.4. The journal uses two-level system for reviewing the articles:

1st level – checking the article on the presence of borrowed text – **mandatory for all articles**. The editorial staff verifies all articles through the system “Antiplagiat”. If the part of the original text is below 85% (borrowing from one source cannot exceed 7%), the article is sent back for revision with the appropriate justification. Borrowing from sites of student works is not allowed. For articles in the fields of philology, literary studies and journalism, the limit for part of original text is at least 75% assuming wide quotation of the analyzed work with the obligatory reference to it.

2nd level – double-blind peer review, both author and reviewer does not know each other – **mandatory for all articles**. Reviewer evaluates an article on structure and style, topical relevance and scientific novelty. All suggestions and comments on the article are documented in the review (Appendix 1). If the problem issues noted by the reviewer can be corrected, then the article is sent back to the author for revision. In case the author decides to ignore the recommendations of the reviewer, the Editorial Board reserves the right to refuse to publish the article. The reviewer also has the right to conduct additional revision on the use of borrowed text in the article by selective copying of parts of the text and checking it through available Internet search system.

The editors together with the Editorial Board of the journal may recommend the article for additional review.

3.5. Reviewer should consider received article it in given period of time and send to the editors by email a review in a proper form or a motivated refusal to review the article.

3.6. The time given for review is determined individually in each case considering conditions for the most rapid publication of articles, but it cannot exceed 15 days from the day the editorial office has received application for publication of the article. The period may be extended if necessary for additional review and/or in case of temporary unavailability of the appropriate reviewer.

3.7. The editorial Board recommends the reviewers to use a standard review form (Appendix 1).

According to the results of peer review, the reviewer shall submit for consideration by the editorial staff and the Editorial Board one of the following decisions:

- recommend the article for publication;
- recommend the article for publication after revision/correction;
- don't recommend the article for publication.

3.8. If the reviewer recommends the article for publication after revision/ correction or does not recommend the article for publication, the review must state the specific reasons for this decision with a clear formulation of substantive and/or technical flaws identified in the manuscript, indicating specific pages if necessary. Comments and suggestions of the reviewer should be objective and principled, aimed at improving the scientific and methodological level of the manuscript.

3.9. Reviewing of the submissions provided with strict confidentiality, and the name of the reviewer does not reported to the author(s).

3.10. The review originals are kept in the editorial office for 5 years. At the request of the Ministry of Education and Science of the Russian Federation, the review must be submitted to the Higher Validation Committee and/or to the Ministry of Education and Science.

3.11. The editors and the Editorial Board have the right to request the recommendation of the student's department for the publication of articles by postgraduate students; however, it does not exclude the usual order of review.

4. Decision on the publishing

4.1. After receiving the reviews the Editorial Board discusses the submitted articles and the opinions of the reviewers and makes the final decisions about publication or refusal of the articles. The decision of the Editorial Board is taken by simple majority of votes. Editor-in-chief has a decisive vote in case of equal sharing of the votes. The quorum for making decision is half of the total number of members of the Editorial Board.

4.2. Making the final decision on publishing or rejection of the article, the editorial Board of the journal drew attention to the topicality of scientific problems that the author solves. The review should clearly describe the theoretical or applied significance of the study, relate the author's conclusions to the existing scientific concepts. Necessary element of the review is assessment of personal contribution of the author to the problem solution. It is advisable to mention in the review the conformity of style, logic and comprehensible presentation to the scientific nature of the material, as well as the reliability and validity of the findings (to assess the representativeness of practical material involved in the analysis, how well has been illustrated the examples, tables, quantitative data, etc.). The review ends with an overall evaluation and recommendation for publication, revision or reasoned rejection of the material.

4.3. On the basis of the decision, the editor sends a letter to author(s) by email giving overall assessment of the article and informing about the decision on the submitted materials.

4.4. If the article can be published after revision and correction, the letter will include recommendations for revision/correction. Reviewers and the Editorial Board would not discuss these comments with the author(s).

4.5. Article sent by the author(s) after revision/correction is subjected to reviewing again. It can be reviewed by the same reviewer or another appointed at the discretion of the editors.

4.6. If the article has many critical comments but overall opinion of the reviewer is positive, the Editorial Board can relate the material to disputable and publish it in as a part scientific discussion.

4.7. In case of rejection of the article, the Editorial Board sends the author a reasoned refusal within three working days.

The article that is not recommended by the reviewer for publication, would be not be accepted by the editors to reconsider.