

ACCEPTED

By decision of the Scientific and Technical
of the Council of the Federal State Budgetary Educational
Institution of Higher Education "Chechenskiy
state pedagogical university"

dated "___" _____ 2023.

Minutes No. _____

APPROVED

Vice-rector for Research and
International Activities of the
Chechen State Pedagogical
University

_____ Avtaeva T.A.

"___" _____ 2023 г.

1. GENERAL PROVISIONS

1.1. Scientific journal "Izvestia of the Chechen State Pedagogical University. The Humanities and Social Sciences Series (hereinafter referred to as the Scientific Journal) is a periodical printed scientific peer-reviewed journal (ISSN of the printed version – 2587-6074). The scientific journal is registered with the Federal Service for Supervision of Communications, Information Technology and Mass Communications (Roskomnadzor), certificate PI No. TU 20-00112 dated 05/24/2016.

1.2. Founder and publisher of the Scientific Journal: Federal State Budgetary educational institution of Higher Education "Chechen State Pedagogical University" (364053, Russian Federation, Chechen Republic, Grozny, ul. Subry Kishieva, 33).

1.3. The editorial board of the Scientific Journal, in carrying out its activities, relies on the Law of the Russian Federation dated December 27, 1991 No. 2124-1 "On Mass Media", the Law of the Russian Federation dated July 10, 1992 No. 3266-1 "On Education", the Charter of the Federal State Budgetary educational institution of Higher Education "Chechen State Pedagogical University" (hereinafter – CHPU), as well as the Charter of the Editorial Board of the Scientific Journal, the Policy of the Scientific Journal regarding compliance with ethical standards when publishing articles, decisions adopted and approved by the editorial board.

2. THE PROCEDURE FOR THE INITIAL REVIEW OF THE ARTICLE

2.1. The materials submitted to the editorial Board are initially reviewed for:

2.1.1. Compliance of the package of submitted documents with the requirements of the editorial board posted on the website of the Scientific Journal at the Internet address: [https://chspu.ru/avtoram /](https://chspu.ru/avtoram/).

2.1.2. Meeting the requirements for the design of the manuscript presented in the Terms of publication of articles in a Scientific journal posted on the journal page of the

official website of the CHPU [https://chspu.ru/avtoram /](https://chspu.ru/avtoram/).

2.2. Manuscripts designed without taking into account the Conditions of publication of articles in a Scientific journal are not considered, the author is informed of the refusal to review the manuscript due to its non-compliance with the Conditions.

2.3. If the manuscript meets the Conditions of publication, and the submitted package of materials is complete, the editorial board submits the manuscript for review.

2.4. The publication reviews all materials submitted to the editorial office that correspond to its subject matter in order to assess them.

2.5. All reviewers must be qualified specialists in the subject of the reviewed materials and have published on the subject of the reviewed article within the last three years. The reviews are kept in the editorial office of the publication for 5 years.

2.6. The editorial board of the publication sends copies of the reviews to the Ministry of Science and Higher Education of the Russian Federation upon receipt of a corresponding request to the editorial office of the publication.

3. THE PROCEDURE FOR REVIEWING MANUSCRIPTS

3.1. The reviewer may not be the author or co-author of the reviewed work, as well as scientific supervisors of applicants for an academic degree and employees of the department in which the author works.

3.3. At the discretion of the authors, an external review may be submitted when submitting a manuscript, which, however, does not exclude the usual review procedure.

3.4. Reviewers do not have the right to take advantage of knowledge about the content of the work before its publication.

3.5. Reviewers are obliged to follow the accepted Policy of the Scientific Journal regarding compliance with ethical standards when publishing articles.

3.6. The review is compiled according to the standard form proposed by the editorial board (Appendix 1) or in free form, with mandatory coverage of the following provisions:

- compliance of the content of the article with its title;
- the novelty of the problem considered in the article, its relevance and practical significance;
- compliance of the article with modern achievements in the field of science under consideration;
- the form of submission of the material;
- advantages and disadvantages of the article;
- the expediency of publishing the article.

The final part of the review should contain reasonable conclusions about the article as a whole and a clear recommendation on the expediency of its publication in a Scientific journal or on the need for its revision.

In case of a negative assessment of the manuscript as a whole (recommendation on

the inexpediency of publication), the reviewer must justify his conclusions.

In case of non-compliance of the manuscript with one or more criteria, the reviewer indicates in the review the need to finalize the article and gives recommendations to the author on improving the article (indicating the inaccuracies and errors made by the author).

3.7. The editorial board informs the author of the review result. Articles finalized by the author are re-sent for review to the same reviewer who made critical comments, or to another at the discretion of the editorial board.

3.8. If the author does not agree with the reviewer's comments, he may apply for a second review or withdraw the article, which he informs the editorial board of the Scientific Journal.

3.9. In case of a negative review, the article is transferred to another reviewer, who is not informed about the results of the previous review. In case of a negative result of repeated review, copies of negative reviews are sent to the author(s).

3.10. The final decision on the expediency of publication after review is made by the editorial board.

3.11. Are not allowed to be published in a Scientific journal:

- articles whose subject matter does not relate to the scientific direction of the Scientific Journal;
- articles containing previously published material;
- articles containing unfair borrowings;
- articles that are not properly designed, the authors of which refuse to technically refine the articles;
- articles whose authors did not revise the article based on the constructive comments of the reviewer.

3.12. The accepted deadlines for reviewing and reviewing manuscripts are no more than 30 days.

3.13. The publication must review all materials submitted to the editorial office that correspond to its subject matter in order to assess them. All reviewers must be qualified specialists in the subject of the reviewed materials and have published on the subject of the reviewed article within the last three years. The reviews are kept in the editorial office of the publication for 5 years.

3.14. Articles of graduate students and applicants are accepted and submitted for review only if there is a positive review from the supervisor / consultant. The accompanying documents must be signed and stamped (sent by scan to e-mail).

3.15. The editorial board of the publication sends the authors copies of reviews of the submitted materials and/or a reasoned refusal to publish the submitted materials.

3.17. The article sent to the author for revision must be returned in a corrected form within a month. A letter from the authors should be attached to the revised manuscript, containing answers to all comments and explaining all the changes made in the article

(separate file and highlight the changes in color in the text of the article). The article modified (revised) by the author with accompanying comments is re-sent for review. The date of receipt to the editorial office is the date of return of the revised article.

3.18. In case of a positive review and recommendation by the reviewer of the material for publication, the manuscript and the text of the review are considered at a meeting of the editorial board. The decision on the expediency of publication is made by the editorial board. After the editorial board decides to allow the article to be published, the executive secretary of the journal informs the author about this by e-mail and indicates the possible publication dates.

3.19. The order of publication of articles is determined by the registration date of their receipt by the editorial board. Works devoted to particularly relevant problems of science, as well as containing fundamentally new information, may, by decision of the editorial board, be published out of turn.

3.20. The Editorial Board has the right to edit the submitted manuscript on its own, without prejudice to its content and author's style.

3.21. All materials are checked for plagiarism. The originality of the materials accepted for publication must be at least 80%.

3.22. If the publication of an article has resulted in a violation of someone's copyright or generally accepted norms of scientific ethics, the editorial board of the journal has the right to withdraw the published article.

3.23. The editorial board does not engage with the authors in a meaningful discussion of articles, correspondence on the methodology of writing and formatting scientific articles and does not bring articles to the necessary scientific, methodological or technical level.

Scientific peer-reviewed journal "Proceedings of the Chechen State Pedagogical University. Series of Humanities and Social Sciences

RECENT.¹

for the manuscript of the article "PREEMPTION OF FORMATION OF THE BASIS OF ECOLOGICAL UNDERSTANDINGS IN CHILDREN OF OLD PRE-SCHOOL AGE AND YOUNG SCHOOLERS IN THE PROCESS OF EXCURSION WORK".

Authors: _____

Date of receipt of manuscript in the editorial office _____ Registration number _____

I. OVERALL EVALUATION			
1. relevance of the study:			
yes		+	
no			
2. Problem formulation:			4. Reliability of results:
clear			experimental results are metrologically reliable (for natural and technical sciences)
requires clarification		+	experimental results require a more detailed analysis
fuzzy			theoretical conclusions are confirmed by the results of experiments
unacceptable			conclusions and hypotheses are not sufficiently supported by experimental results
3. scientific novelty:			conclusions and hypotheses contradict known scientific facts
the work contains new hypotheses and theoretical conclusions			5. Interpretation of results:
the work presents a review/summarisation of known facts and hypotheses		+	justified
new methods (techniques) are proposed			important points missed
known methods		+	overgeneralisations
new experimental data			unclear
II. PRESENTATION OF MATERIAL			
6. Article title:		9. Presentation of material and style:	
captures the essence of the publication			acceptable
should be changed			too short
7. Annotation:			contains material not related to the topic of the article
clear, reflecting the essence of the publication		+	article is unstructured
language revision required			minor editing
semantic revision is required			major revision required
8. References:		10. Figures, tables:	
correct and complete			picture quality is acceptable
incomplete			Fig./table No. _____ must be changed
incorrect			fig./table no. _____ can be removed
III. REVIEWER'S CONCLUSION			
11. Recommendations:		12. Remarks:	
recommended for publication			1.
is recommended for publication after minor revisions			2.
is recommended for publication after revision without re-reviewing			3.
is recommended for publication after revision and repeated peer review			4.

not recommended for publication		5.	
		reviewer wishes to remain anonymous	
RECENSEE.	_____	NAME	
	signature		

¹The reviewer's opinion is marked with + in the appropriate line