Guidelines
for the materials review coming to the editorial department of the journal
"Information Systems and Technologies"

1. All materials coming to the editorial department appropriate to the theme of the edition should be reviewed for getting of   expert evaluation.

2. Acknowledged experts in subject of the materials being reviewed who have publications within the space of last three years on subject of the article reviewed are involved as reviewers of the journal Information Systems and Technologies.

3. Reviewer should estimate coming materials according to the following criteria:

-relevance and matching of material to subject of the journal;

-originality, scientific level and degree of scientific novelty of the results

being represented for the publication, their scientific importance and practical value;

-advantages and disadvantages of the content and reporting format

- specific recommendations on refinement or reduction of material;

-opportunity (or impossibility) of publishing of reviewed material in the journal Information Systems and Technologies.

4. The review on the paper medium (two copies) and in electronic form are sent to the editorial office of the journal within timeframes set by the editorial board.

5. The prepared reviews of the staff of the third-party organizations are signed by reviewers, and the signature is certified in accordance with the established procedure.

6. The reviews(both positive and negative) coming to the edition office, one of the editorial board member gets acquainted with it and presents it at the editorial board meeting where the decision about   its publication or rejection is made.

7. The further work with the material for the publication is carried out by the editorial office according to technological process of the edition.

8. The editorial office sends to authors the copies of reviews or motivated refusal. Anonymity of reviewers is guaranteed by editorial office of the journal.

9. The materials subject to refinement are sent by the editorial office to authors with the text of the review containing specific recommendations on refinement.

10. The materials after refinement are sent to the reviewer for the additional reviewing. The reviewer must present the next version of the review within the established deadlines whereby the editorial board makes the decision about its publication or rejection.

11. When rejected , the editorial board sends to authors the notice with the formulation: "It is rejected according to the solution of the editorial board of the journal" with short reasoning , for example, "the scientific review doesn't correspond to subject of the journal", "article didn't pass on competition", etc.

12. Reviews are stored in publishing house and in editorial office within 5 years.

13. On coming to the editorial office of the relevant inquiry it sends the copies of reviews to the Ministry of Education and Sciences of the Russian Federation.

Editor-in-chief of the journal
"Information systems
and technologies" I.S. Konstantinov

REVIEW
of an article

Author(s) _____

Title _____

Presented for publishing in the journal
"Information Systems and Technologies"

In the review conceptual issues of article have to be commented, generalized reasoned assessment have to be given and conclusions have to be drawn on the scientific importance of work and possibility of its publication in the journal Information Systems and Technologies.

In the review the following aspects are described:

- matching of material to subject of the journal;
- problem statement in common;

- statement of a problem in a general view;
- allocation of unresolved parts of a common problem;
- statement of research results;
- sequence (logicality) of the statement;
- article structuring (sections "Introduction", several internal sections, "Conclusion", "The list of the used literature");
- literacy of the statement;
- compactness and presentation of illustrative material;
- competent use of scientific terms;
- originality and novelty of results of researches;
- theoretical and practical value of work.

Conclusion:

a) to recommend an article for publication in the journal «Information Systems and Technologies»;

b) to recommend an article for publication in the journal after refinement

c) not recommend an article for the publication (the reason: discrepancy to subject of the journal, absence of scientific and applied results, etc.)

Reviewer _____
              (science degree, academic rank , full name, personal signature)

«____» _____ 20__