



## Peer-Review Process

### Peer-Review Principles

1. All scientific articles submitted to the Editorial Office of "The Art of Eurasia" journal are subject to a mandatory double-blind review process. This entails that the reviewer is unaware of the identity of the authors of the manuscript, and vice versa. The objective of this procedure is to ensure impartial and expert evaluation of the submitted article.
2. Reviewers are members of the editorial board, as well as by invited reviewers with academic degrees who have enough qualification and research experience to assess scientific manuscripts. All reviewers should be qualified specialists on the subject of the reviewed materials and have publications on the subject of the reviewed article within the last 3 years.
3. Peer-reviewing is conducted according to [Publication Ethics](#).
4. All reviewers work on a voluntary basis without any form of remuneration.
5. All the reviews are kept in the Editorial Office for 5 years and may be sent to the oversight body when getting the corresponding inquiry.

### Peer-Review Process

1. At the first stage of the reviewing process, the Editorial Office reviews manuscripts on the subject of their compliance with the journal's formal requirements (completeness of materials, metadata accuracy and consistency, correct text formatting, quality of illustrative material). At this stage, all articles are checked for the unfair textual borrowing, appropriation of research results and incorrect self-citation using the [Antiplagiat](#)
2. Manuscripts that do not meet the formal requirements or the subject scope of the journal will not be considered or peer reviewed. The Editorial Board decides whether the manuscript shall not be considered or accepted for publication.
3. Manuscripts that meet the formal requirements or the subject scope of the journal are sent to reviewer in the specific field of the submitted manuscript.
4. The reviewer is assigned by the Editor-in-Chief of the journal. Re-reviewing (examining of corrections) is realized by the reviewer who implemented primary peer-reviewing.
5. In the event of a manifest conflict of interest, each reviewer is entitled to withdraw from the review process.
6. **Timeframe:** the reviewer must fill in the attached form and send it within 2 weeks from the date of sending the letter with the request. After this period, the reviewer will be automatically notified of the need to complete the review.
7. The review must be completed in a structured form in accordance with the [Peer-Review Questionnaire](#). The reviewer evaluates an article according to the following **criteria**: 1) compliance of an article with scientific standards (topicality, scientific originality, practical value, the problem statement, formulation of conclusions and argumentation of findings, suitability of references to the research area); compliance of an article with the standard of the material presentation (suitability of an article heading to its content, suitability of an article summary to its content, suitability of an article size to its content, choice of key words and phrases, logic, interconnection and quality of the presented material). Assessments according to each criterion are written in a review with comments if they are necessary.
8. Peer-reviewing results in conclusions about the scientific material compliance with the qualifying standards, necessity of the scientific material improvement, possibility of the scientific material publication.
9. The decision is brought to the author's notice. The editor sends reviews copies, recommendations on an article improvement or reasoned refusal to authors of presented materials.
10. The article finalised by the author is re-sent for peer-review. If the authors refuse to revise the materials, they must notify the Editorial Office in writing of their refusal to publish the article.
11. If the author doesn't agree with any of reviewers' recommendations, he may send a well-reasoned answer. If the author and reviewer have irresolvable contradictions regarding the manuscript, the Editor-in-Chief has the right to send the manuscript for additional peer-review. In conflict situations, the Editor-in-Chief makes the decision.
12. The decision to refuse to publish a manuscript is made by the Editor-in-Chief in accordance with the recommendations of the reviewers.