

GUIDELINES ON THE REVIEW OF ARTICLES SUBMITTED TO THE COLOPROCTOLOGY MAGAZINE

1. An article submitted for the publication to the Coloproctology magazine is reviewed by its Executive Secretary in order to determine its compliance with the magazine key issues, registered by the Publishing Editor and the receipt is confirmed to the authors by email. If necessary the following discrepancies with the publication requirements are highlighted: the volume of an article, the number of illustrations, the presence of abstracts in English and Russian, the presence of references both in the text and at the end of articles, the insufficient information about authors. The authors are recommended to bring the publication in compliance with the requirements prior to the start of the review process and submit it again.
2. The executive secretary and the editor-in-chief take a decision on the reviewers of the articles (1 or 2)
3. All articles submitted to the Coloproctology magazine undergo the independent review. The panel of reviewers may include both members of the editorial board of the Coloproctology magazine and third-party practitioners and researchers with a high degree of expertise in the field.
4. All articles are reviewed confidentially. Reviewers are notified that all articles are private intellectual property of their authors and their content can't be disclosed.
5. If a review contains a reference to necessary adjustments, the article is sent back to the author for corrections. In this case the date of the return of the corrected article is considered to be the acceptance date.
6. All originals of reviews are stored by the Editorial Board for 5 years after the publication and are available to expert councils of the All-Russian Attestation Committee upon request.
7. An article that was sent to an author for review should be corrected and returned to the Editorial Board within 3 months. The corrected variant should also be complemented with a letter from its authors containing a list of responses to all notes and explaining all changes made in the article.
8. If an article underwent considerable changes upon the recommendation of a reviewer, it is sent for a repeat review to the same reviewer.
9. The publishers retain the right to decline an article if its author is unable or unwilling to consider the review.
10. If the initial version of an article receives negative reviews from two reviewers or if the corrected version is vetted by the reviewer the article is rejected without any further reviews by other members of the Editorial Board.
11. If the author doesn't agree with the opinion of a reviewer, he or she has the right to counter it with a detailed response sent to the publishers. The article may be sent for a repeated review or for the clearance to the Editorial Board.
12. The Editorial Board has the sole right to take decisions on the publication after the review.
13. The Executive Secretary informs the author about the decision. The maximum duration of the period between the acceptance of an article and the decision of the Editorial Board on its publication is 2 months.

Guidelines for scientific article reviews

The goal of reviewing process is to ensure the strict selection procedure for the articles to be published and to offer specific directions for their improvement. A review should present an objective evaluation of the article and contain the comprehensive analysis of its scientific advantages and flaws.

Guidelines for the contents of a scientific article review

A reviewer should:

1. Determine the compliance of the article suggested for the publication to the magazine profile.
2. Evaluate the actuality of the contents of the article and its correspondence to the latest developments in science and technology.
3. Evaluate the importance of the obtained research data (scientific and practical)
4. Give the qualitative and/or quantitative evaluation of the data published in the article.
5. Evaluate how comprehensive and verifiable the quoted data are.
6. Evaluate the correctness and preciseness of the used (or introduced) definitions and descriptions

7. Evaluate the literary style of the article.
8. Give well-based conclusions on the article as a whole as well as notes and directions for the improvements (if necessary)
9. The set of the issues above is of general nature. Each specific article requires the individual approach to the selection of evaluation criteria.
10. The final part of a review should contain a precise recommendation on the feasibility of its publication in the presented format based on the analysis of the article or the necessity for its correction or reworking (with practical suggestions) or the impossibility of its publication in the magazine.

Editor-in-Chief of the Coloproctology magazine
President of the Association of Coloproctologists of Russia
Director of the Russian State Research Center of Coloproctology
Professor, Doctor of Medicine

Yu. A. Shelygin