



PEER REVIEW PROCESS

All applications are reviewed by the members of the editorial council. The documents that fit the topic of the magazine are assessed by two independent scientific referents who accepted to review the documents and who send their review to the Editor in Chief. The identity of the assessors is not disclosed to the authors.

The reviewers give the Editor in Chief the review form, including comments on the scientific content of the work and the possibility to publish it. The Editor in Chief summarizes the assessors' observations and communicates them to the author.

Considering the opinions of all reviewers, the Editor in Chief decides whether to accept, review or reject the paper. According to the reviewers' recommendations, the manuscript can be accepted, sent back to the author for minor revisions or rejected

DURING THE PEER REVIEW PROCESS

STEP 1: EDITOR ASSESSMENT

Peer review follows a number of stages:

After submitting your article to RST journal, the journal editor will decide if it's suitable for the journal, asking questions such as:

- the author followed the journal's guidelines?
- Is RST the right journal for this article?

In this step the editor can reject the article if the author did not respect the guidelines or the article it is not proper for this journal.

Otherwise the editor will move to the next stage and start the peer review process.

STAGE 2: FIRST ROUND OF PEER REVIEW

The editor will find and contact two researchers or academics who are experts in your field. They will be asked to read your article, and advise the editor whether to publish your paper in the journal.

They will be checking:

- If your work is original or new;
- If the methodology are described;
- If your results are clearly and appropriately;
- If your conclusions are significant;
- If the work is of a high enough standard to be published in the journal.

After this step, the reviewers will provide comments, suggestions and recommendation (accept, revise or reject).

If there are different opinions between the two reviewers, the editor will sent your article to the 3th reviewer.

STEP 3: REVISE AND RESUBMIT

You can then amend your article based (if the reviewer will request that) on the reviewers' comments, resubmitting it with any or all changes made. You may be asked to make further revisions or the paper may be rejected if the editor thinks that the revisions you have made are not adequate.

STEP 4: ACCEPTED

The peer review process finished and your article will be published.

Find out more about peer review in [this guide from Sense about Science](#)

PEER REVIEW FORM

Research and Science Today

ISSN-p: 2247-4455 / ISSN-e: 2285-9632 / ISSN-e supplement: 2344-0007

Title of the article:

Recommendation of the reviewer following the article analysis (one of the variants will be selected):

- A) **Accept as is** - No changes are necessary and manuscript is ready to be published
- B) **Conditional acceptance after MINOR revisions** - The quality of **scientific content** is good to excellent. The **structure of the manuscript** is good and findings are laid out logically. Writing style is moderate to good and small changes are required
- C) **Invite for submission after MAJOR revisions** - The quality of the **scientific content** ranges from good to moderate. The **structure the manuscript** is moderate and the presentation needs to be improved. The writing style is moderate. However, the research topic is important and original and the article should be resubmitted after major changes are made
- D) **Reject** - The quality of the **scientific content** is poor and the topic is either not original or is not worthy of publication. The **structure of the manuscript** is unredeemable and needs to be completely re-written before it can be considered for another review.

Analyzing the content of the manuscript

Originality

--

Methodology

--

Bibliography

--

Quality and coherence of argumentation

Analysis of the form of the manuscript

Title, summary, key words

Structure of the manuscript

Clarity and coherence of language (translation)

Date:

Reviewer: