

«APPROVED»

Editor-in-chief of the

Russian scientific journal

"Economics and Management"

O.G. Smeshko

202 4



REVIEW POLICY OF THE RUSSIAN SCIENTIFIC JOURNAL "ECONOMICS AND MANAGEMENT" (RSJ "ECONOMICS AND MANAGEMENT")

The editorial office of the Russian Scientific Journal "Economics and Management" adheres to COPE recommendations when working with manuscripts, reviewers, and when organizing the reviewing process.

REVIEWING PROCESS

All manuscripts submitted to the editorial office of the Russian Scientific Journal "Economics and Management" are subject to double-blind peer review. It means that neither the author nor the reviewer knows each other's names and places of work, and all correspondence is conducted through the editor of the journal.

The decision on the selection of a reviewer for the journal is made by the head of the Publishing and Printing Center. Each article is sent to at least two reviewers. If different opinions about the manuscript are received, a third expert (reviewer) may be involved in reviewing process.

The reviewing process takes an average of 1 to 8 weeks. It includes time for initial review of the manuscript, selection of reviewers, time for preparation of reviews, time for revision of the article by the author and re-review, involvement of additional experts (reviewers).

The editor of the journal can send one of the following decisions on the manuscript to the author:

- **Accept for publication.** In this case, the manuscript will be included in one of the regular issues of the journal and will be sent to the editor for further work. The author will be notified of the publication date.
- **Accept for publication after correcting the shortcomings noted by the reviewer.** In this case, the author will be asked to make the changes indicated by the reviewer to the manuscript within a week. If deficiencies are eliminated or if there is a reasoned refusal to make changes (in this case, this reasoned refusal must be reviewed and approved by the reviewers who commented on the manuscript), the manuscript is accepted for publication.
- **Accept for publication after correcting the shortcomings noted by reviewers and re-reviewing.** In this case, the author will be asked to make changes indicated by the reviewer to the manuscript within two weeks. The manuscript will be sent for re-reviewing. The author will receive a final decision regarding the publication of the manuscript within 30 days.
- **Reject.** In this case, a reasoned refusal to publish the manuscript will be sent to the author. The refusal to publish does not prohibit the authors from further sending manuscripts to the journal, however, if the publication is refused due to gross violations on the part of the author, the editor-in-chief may decide to include the author in the "blacklist". In this case, other articles of this author will not be considered by the editorial office of the journal.
- **Reject and invite the author to submit the article for review again.** In this case, the authors are invited to conduct the study again, taking into account the recommended

changes, and submit new results for review. Such a solution is also possible in cases when the article requires many changes or when it is not possible to obtain the requested additional information from the author.

The editorial office of the journal organizes three rounds of review, which means that after the first decision to finalize the article, the author has two attempts to make changes based on the reviewer's recommendation or motivated rejection of them. If, after the third round of review, the expert sends comments again, the editor of the journal will invite the author to consider the possibility of publishing in another journal or to submit the article again for review with the amendments no earlier than six months later.

If the author does not plan to finalize the article, the author must notify the editorial office of the journal. The article will be discontinued.

In the process of reviewing a manuscript, a conflict may arise between the author and reviewers. In this case, the editor of the journal has the right to appoint a new reviewer for the manuscript and involve the editor-in-chief to resolve disputes.

The Russian Scientific Journal "Economics and Management" may publish articles by members of the editorial council (editor-in-chief, deputies) and members of the editorial council, but there should be no abuse. External experts can be involved to resolve contradictions and conflict situations. In the event of a conflict regarding the decision to publish the editor-in-chief's manuscript, the final decision on the possibility of publishing the article is made by the members of the editorial council.

When publishing articles by members of the editorial board/council, the editor-in-chief and his deputy, information about the affiliation of the authors to the journal is indicated in the "Conflict of Interest" section.

The Russian Scientific Journal "Economics and Management" does not exempt scientists from reviewing manuscripts, regardless of their status.

All the copies of the reviews are kept in the editorial office of the journal for at least 5 years.

THE COMPOSITION OF THE REVIEWERS

The review of incoming manuscripts involves experts with experience in the relevant subject area and publications on the subject of the reviewed manuscript over the past 3 years.

If the subject of the article is very narrow and/or the author claims a potential conflict of interest in reviewing, members of the editorial board and/or the editorial council may be involved in reviewing.

PRINCIPLES OF REVIEWERS' SELECTION AND ACTIONS OF THE EDITORIAL COUNCIL OF THE JOURNAL TO ENSURE HIGH QUALITY EXPERTISE

The editorial office of the journal regularly works to attract the recognized experts in the field of Economics and Management.

Reviewers are invited to work with the journal on the recommendation of the scientific editors, the editor-in-chief, his deputies, members of the editorial council, as well as authors.

Scientific editors of the journal regularly monitor publications on the subject of the journal in international scientometric databases, RSCI, etc., on the basis of which they send invitations for cooperation to the authors of publications.

The first reviews prepared by new reviewers are evaluated according to the following criteria:

- The presence of the reviewer's comments on the importance of the issue raised in the study.
- The presence of the reviewer's comments on the originality of the manuscript.
- The reviewer's indication of the strengths and weaknesses of the research (research design, data collection and analysis).
- The availability of useful comments from the reviewer regarding the language and structure of the article, tables and figures.
- The constructiveness of the reviewer's comments.

- The presence of the reviewer's arguments using examples from the article to substantiate their comments.
- The presence of the reviewer's comments regarding the author's interpretation of the results.
- The overall quality of the review.
- For each of the points, from 1 to 5 points can be assigned, where 1 is the minimum score and 5 is the maximum.

If the quality of the review does not satisfy the scientific editor, the editor-in-chief or the deputy editor-in-chief of the journal, cooperation with the reviewer is terminated.

If the selection is successful, the editorial office concludes a Cooperation Agreement with the reviewer (Annex 1).

Scientific editors, the editor-in-chief, or the deputy editor-in-chief of the journal have the right to evaluate an unlimited number of reviews from all experts involved in cooperation with the journal using the presented algorithm.

The editors of the journal consider reviewing to be one of the important procedures when working with the journal and value the experience and time of the experts involved in reviewing.

The reviewers receive a right for a priority publication in the journal.

The names of the reviewers and their places of work may be published on the website of the journal in open access with their written consent without specifying which articles they reviewed.

CONFIDENTIALITY

The editorial office of the Russian Scientific Journal “Economics and Management” does not transfer personal data of reviewers and personal data of authors.

Any manuscript is considered by the editorial office of the journal as a confidential document. The editorial office expects that reviewers will not share or discuss the texts of the manuscripts with third parties without the consent received from the editor of the journal. Reviewers may involve third parties to work on the review only with the consent of the editor of the journal.

RESPONSIBILITY OF THE REVIEW

By agreeing to review manuscripts, the reviewer agrees to follow the journal's review policy when evaluating the manuscript, preparing reviews, as well as regarding the reviewer's behavior and compliance with ethical requirements.

The reviewer should strive to ensure the high quality of the published materials in the journal and, therefore, should review the manuscript only if there is sufficient experience in the field under consideration and sufficient time for a thorough and comprehensive review of the article.

The reviewer is obliged to refuse reviewing if:

- is a supervisor or subordinate of the author of the manuscript, as well as a holder of joint grants, within the framework of which the article sent for review has been prepared;
- the reviewer does not plan to prepare a review, but only wants to get acquainted with the text of the article;
- is preparing to publish his or her own article on a similar topic;
- reviews an article on a similar topic.

The reviewer is obliged to inform the editor of his intention to review the article, as well as to complete the work within the deadline specified by the editor. If it is impossible to conduct a review for any reason, it is advisable to recommend another expert to the editor.

The reviewer cannot use his status for personal purposes and impose links to his work on the authors.

RECOMMENDATION FOR THE REVIEWERS

For the convenience of reviewers, the editorial office of the journal suggests using the form for quick reviewing - it reflects questions that the editor needs to answer in order to make a decision about the article.

The editorial office of the journal asks the reviewer to pay more attention to the section "Final conclusion, or comments to the Author/s" in order to help the authors to improve the current and subsequent work.

It is not necessary to waste time and efforts reviewing an irrelevant manuscript, regardless of its quality. First of all, it is necessary to determine whether the manuscript corresponds to the subject area of the scientific journal and the interests of its audience.

The work on research design, scientific methods, structure and content, as well as the depth of analysis must meet all necessary requirements and not deviate from the principles of impartial scientific research. The results of the study should be reproducible, the sample under study should be properly compiled and analyzed in sufficient detail to summarize the results of the study.

The conducted research should bring something new to the relevant subject area. The research must meet the requirements of originality and be impartial in terms of conflicts of interest. No matter how great the intended significance of a manuscript is, it cannot be allowed to be published in case of redundancy, plagiarism, or violation of the basic ethical principles of scientific research: legality, usefulness, and respect for people.

THE CONTENT AND STRUCTURE OF THE REVIEW

The editorial office of the Russian Scientific Journal "Economics and Management" recommends that reviewers evaluate the content of the manuscript according to the following criteria: 1. relevance; 2. originality of the research; 3. relevance of the methodology used; 4. accuracy and clarity of the presentation of the material; 5. quality of data; 6. scientific value and long-term perspective.

Evaluation of the manuscript elements

The editorial office of the Russian Scientific Journal "Economics and Management" suggests paying attention to compliance with the following requirements and recommendations to speed up the process of preparing an expert opinion and providing the most complete information about the article to the editor and the author.

Title

The title should correspond exactly to the content of the manuscript and attract the attention of readers.

Annotation

The content of the manuscript should be presented in the abstract in an appropriate manner (the abstract is structured, with a description of the goals, objectives, methods, results and conclusions). There should be no discrepancies between the abstract and the sections of the manuscript, the abstract should be presented clearly without reading the manuscript.

Introduction

The introduction should clearly define the purpose of the study and set objectives. It is necessary to pay attention to whether the author substantiates the relevance and significance of the research based on the literature review and whether this part meets the volume requirements; whether the author provides definitions of terms found in the manuscript; whether there is a clearly formulated hypothesis in the manuscript.

Literature review

The literature review should be holistic.

Methods

Attention should be paid to whether other researchers will be able to reproduce the results of the study using the proposed methods, or whether the methods are not clear; whether the authors justify their choice when describing the research methods (for example, the choice of visualization methods, analytical tools or statistical methods); if the authors express a hypothesis, developed

methods that allow them to reasonably verify hypothesis; how the research design is presented; how data analysis helps you achieve your goals.

Results

Special attention should be paid to the clarity of the results presented, their justification and expectation, as well as to whether the order of presentation of the results coincides with the order of description of the methods and how accurate the presentation of the results is.

Discussions

The discussion section should be brief. If there is a hypothesis, it is necessary to pay attention to whether the authors report whether it has been confirmed or refuted. If the hypothesis has not been confirmed, it should be noted by the authors whether the question posed in the study has been answered. It is necessary to pay attention to whether the conclusions of the authors correspond to the results obtained during the study. If unexpected results are obtained, the authors should properly analyze them. It is also important to note the potential contribution that research makes to the industry and to global science.

Conclusions

Attention should be paid to whether the authors note the limitations of the study and whether there are additional limitations that should be noted; whether the authors' opinion on these limitations and on the direction of future research is presented.

List of sources

The list of sources must match the format of the journal. It is necessary to pay attention to the number of references, the relevance and authority of sources, the correspondence of references in the text to articles from the list of sources, as well as the presence of bibliographic errors in the list of sources.

Tables

Special attention should be paid to whether the tables available in the manuscript describe the research results correctly and whether they are sufficient; whether the data presented in the tables facilitates the perception of information.

Pictures

The choice of tables and figures should be appropriate. Attention should be paid to whether the pictures and graphs reliably show important results, whether it is necessary to make changes to the pictures and graphs for a more accurate and visual presentation of the results, whether the captions to the pictures and graphs allow readers to understand the information without referring to the manuscript itself.

It is important that information about conflicts of interest is disclosed and information about financing (if any) is clearly indicated.

Confidential comments for the editor

Confidential comments is a section intended for comments that will not be shared with the authors. It includes the reviewer's final conclusion on the recommended editorial decision on the manuscript, the reviewer's assumptions, the expression of doubts about a possible violation of ethics, a conflict of interest related to the content of the manuscript or its authors, as well as recommendations and accompanying comments (for example, the reviewer may advise the editor to request additional information from the author).

Final conclusions or comments to the author/s

An important part of the review is a detailed and reasoned explanation of the acceptance of the article for publication, consisting of an introductory part describing the main conclusions and the value of the article for readers, the main comments describing the relevance of the article for the purposes and objectives of the journal, as well as the level of reliability.

The final conclusion may contain special comments from the reviewer evaluating sections of the article (abstract, introduction, methods, results, discussion, conclusions, etc.) or comments on

specific pages, paragraphs, or lines. The final comment is a brief description of the strengths and weaknesses of the manuscript without any additional recommendations.

If the article requires significant or minor revision, the reviewer gives recommendations (comments) to the author to improve the quality of the manuscript and, possibly, future research.

Final decision of the reviewer

The editorial office of the Russian Scientific Journal “Economics and Management” suggests using the following justification for the final decision of the reviewer.

Accept the article for publication without any modifications

The reviewer understands that the article is ready for publication in the current submission. The article is well-founded, ethical, significant for the scientific community and complements the already published works, the writing style is clear and concise.

Accept the article for publication after correcting the shortcomings noted by the reviewer

There are uncritical comments about the article that need to be corrected. It may include, for example, poor style of the article, lack of clarity of presentation, insufficiently elaborated structure of the article, errors in references, duplication of information in figures and tables and in the text of the article. After making changes and re-evaluating the article, it can be accepted for publication.

Accept the article for publication after correcting the shortcomings noted by the reviewer and re-reviewing

There are serious shortcomings and errors in the article that affect the reliability of the results obtained: problems with ethics, research design, gaps in the description of research methods, poorly presented results or their incorrect interpretation, an insufficiently complete description of the limitations of the study, contradictory (or refuted by the author's own statements) conclusions, lack of references to important studies, unclear tables and drawings that require serious revision. After re-evaluation, the article can be accepted, rejected, or sent for additional examination. Such a decision often requires the collection of additional data from the author.

Reject, the article is not recommended for publication

The work does not meet the goals and objectives of the journal, has one or more unavoidable shortcomings or serious ethical problems: consent to publication was not obtained in cases where it was necessary, the research methods are unethical, the methodology is discredited or erroneous (for example, a process that seriously affects the results is ignored). It means that the author is not recommended to submit the corrected document without a special request. The reviewer should give detailed comments explaining the decision, as they can help the author to improve the work.

Reject and invite the author to submit the article for review again

The topic or question of the study is interesting, but the author uses incorrect or insufficiently reliable methods, therefore, the data obtained is also not reliable. Such a solution is also possible in cases where the article requires many changes or when it is not possible to obtain the requested additional information from the author. The authors are invited to conduct the study again, taking into account the recommended changes, and submit new results for reviewing.

EDITING THE REVIEWS

The editorial office of the journal expects that the reviews will be written in a friendly tone and in accordance with the rules of the Russian language. It is forbidden to become personal, insult authors, and pointlessly criticize any aspect of the research, the language and style of the manuscript, etc.

The editorial office of the journal tries to send reviews to the authors in their original form, however, in some cases it may be necessary to change the text of the review without losing its meaning (for example, when combining comments from several experts on one issue or if there are comments in the reviews section that are intended for the author).

The editorial office of the journal has the right to send reviews for revision to an expert in case of a large number of errors or an unacceptable tone of the review.

**COOPERATION AGREEMENT
with the Russian scientific journal "Economics and Management"**

« ____ » _____ 202_

Saint Petersburg

The private educational institution of higher education "Saint Petersburg University of Management Technologies and Economics", represented by Rector Oleg Grigoryevich Smeshko, acting on the basis of the Charter, hereinafter referred to as the "Editorial Office", on the one hand and _____, hereinafter referred to as the "Reviewer", on the other hand, have entered into this Agreement as follows:

1. SUBJECT OF THE AGREEMENT

1.1. The Reviewer agrees to review articles in accordance with the Publication Ethics of the Editorial Office of the Russian Scientific Journal “Economics and Management”, which is available on <https://emjume.elpub.ru/jour/about/editorialPolicies#custom-2>, in the following specialties:

- ☐ 2.3.4. Management in organizational systems (technical sciences);
- ☐ 5.2.1. Economic theory (economic sciences);
- ☐ 5.2.3. Regional and sectoral economics (economic sciences);
- ☐ 5.2.4. Finance (Economics);
- ☐ 5.2.5. World Economy (economic sciences);
- ☐ 5.2.6. Management (economic sciences).

1.2. The Editorial Office agrees to publish the Reviewer's scientific articles in the Russian Scientific Journal “Economics and Management” after of the completed review.

1.3. A review is considered to be a meaningful written review of an article (in *.doc format in the form of a form, Annex 1 to this Agreement), suggesting the presence of the detailed and reasoned explanation in column 5. "Final conclusion, or comments to the Author/s". The published articles are uploaded to the platform eLibrary.ru, along with the final conclusion that is not publicly available to users.

1.4. The Reviewer's scientific articles are accepted in the following order: 12 (twelve) reviews, issued in accordance with clause 1.3 of this Agreement, are equal to 1 (one) article with a volume of 16,000 to 40,000 characters with spaces, issued in accordance with the Order and conditions of publication, available on <https://emjume.elpub.ru/jour/about/submissions#authorGuidelines>. All the articles must meet the requirements set by the Editorial Office of the Russian Scientific Journal “Economics and Management”. All the submitted materials are sent for anonymous peer review in accordance with the Procedure for reviewing publications, which is available on <https://emjume.elpub.ru/jour/about/editorialPolicies#custom-0>.

2. RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE REVIEWER AND THE PUBLISHER

The Reviewer is obliged to:

- upon receipt of the article for review, notify the Editorial Office of the journal in a timely manner about the possibility / impossibility of carrying out the work.;
- to conduct the review in accordance with the Publication Ethics of the Russian Scientific Journal “Economics and Management”;
- to conduct the review within a period not exceeding 10 (ten) calendar days.

The Editorial Office is obliged to:

- send articles for reviewing (without specifying the full name and other identifying information of the Author);
- accept ready-made reviews;
- send reviews to the Author of the article (without specifying the full name and other identifying information of the Reviewer);

- upload to the eLibrary platform reviews of published articles (at the discretion of the Editorial Office);
- publish the Reviewer's articles on account of the completed review (publication of a scientific article under the terms of an Agreement is allowed in co-authorship).

3. TERMS OF THE AGREEMENT

3.1. The Agreement comes into force from the moment of its signing by the parties. It is valid until December 31, 202_ (in accordance with the Order).

3.2. The Agreement may be terminated prematurely with a written notice from one of the Parties and terminates after one month from the date of sending the other Party a notice of termination of the Agreement. In this case, the terms of termination of the Agreement are determined by mutual agreement of the Parties.

4. TERMS OF THE AGREEMENT

4.1. By signing the Agreement, the Reviewer agrees to the processing and storage of personal data in accordance with Federal Law No. 152-FZ dated 27.07.2006 "On Personal Data".

4.2. The Editorial Office is obliged not to disclose to third parties or distribute the Reviewer's personal data, with the exception of those data that is used for the purpose of individualizing the Reviewer when publishing the Article (including when uploading journal issues to the platform eLibrary.ru), without the consent of the personal data subject, unless otherwise provided by Federal Law No. 152-FZ of 27.07.2006 "About personal data".

5. OTHER CONDITIONS

5.1. Any amendments and additions to this Agreement are valid only if they are made in writing and signed by authorized representatives of both Parties. The annexes to this Agreement form an integral part of it.

5.2. This Agreement is drawn up in two copies in Russian, having the same legal force, each of the Parties has one copy of this Agreement.

6. SIGNATURES OF THE PARTIES

Редакция:

The private educational institution of higher education "Saint Petersburg University of Management Technologies and Economics"
190020, Saint Petersburg,
Lermontovsky pr., 44, A
TIN – 7826001459, KPP – 783901001
Account № 40703810117000003177
in Bank Saint Petersburg
Saint Petersburg
to the Account № 30101810900000000790
BIK – 044030790,
OKATO – 40262566000

E-mail: izdat-ime@yandex.ru

Rector

_____ / O.G. Smeshko

The Reviewer:

Surname: _____
Name: _____
Patronymic Name: _____
Passport: series _____ № _____
Issued: _____
Date of birth: _____
Telephone: _____
Address: _____

E-mail:

The Reviewer

_____ / _____ / _____

Review
on the article to the Russian Scientific Journal "Economics and Management"
« _____ »

Scientific specialty (no more than three):

- ☐ 2.3.4. Management in organizational systems (technical sciences);
- ☐ 5.2.1. Economic theory (economic sciences);
- ☐ 5.2.3. Regional and sectoral economics (economic sciences);
- ☐ 5.2.4. Finance (Economics);
- ☐ 5.2.5. World Economy (economic sciences);
- ☐ 5.2.6. Management (economic sciences).

The form of the report

Evaluation criteria					
1. Content	Excellent	Good	Satisfactory	Poor	n/a*
1.1 – Relevance		+			
1.2 – Originality of the research		+			
1.3 – Relevance of the methodology used		+			
1.4 – Accuracy and clarity of the presentation of the material		+			
1.5 – Quality of data		+			
1.6 – Scientific value and long-term perspective		+			
2. Оценка элементов рукописи	Excellent	Good	Satisfactory	Poor	n/a*
2.1 – Title		+			
2.2 – Annotation		+			
2.3 – Introduction		+			
2.4 – Literature review		+			
2.5 – Methods		+			
2.6 – Results			+		
2.7 – Discussions		+			
2.8 – Conclusions		+			
3. Other criteria	Excellent	Good	Satisfactory	Poor	n/a*
3.1 – Relevance and credibility of sources			+		
3.2 – Relevance and clarity of pictures and graphs		+			
Other remarks					
4. Confidential comments for the editor (this data will be deleted):					
5. Final conclusions and comments to the author/s:					
Final conclusions					
Accepted for publication without any modifications	+				
Accepted for publication after correcting the shortcomings noted by the reviewer					
Accepted for publication after correcting the shortcomings noted by the reviewer and re-reviewing					
Rejected, the article is not recommended for publication					
Rejected, the author is invited to submit the article for review again					

* n/a — not applicable