



Санкт-Петербургский государственный университет
St Petersburg State University

Вестник Санкт-Петербургского университета. Экономика
St Petersburg University Journal of Economic Studies

Издается с 1946 г.

Адрес редакции журнала: 191123, Санкт-Петербург, ул. Чайковского, д. 62. Экономический факультет СПбГУ, каб. 106;
тел.: (812) 363-6771 (редакция); 363-6494 (тел./факс); e-mail: economics.vestnik@spbu.ru

Статьи доступны к чтению на сайте: <http://vestnik.spbu.ru/s05.html>

Журнал индексируется в базах: RePEc, WoS RSCI, eLibrary, Перечень журналов ВАК РФ

ISSN: 1026-356X
Index Catalogue: 36318

PROVISIONS

for reviewing manuscripts submitted for publishing in the journal

Preamble

These provisions are developed in accordance with the order of publication in scientific journals sponsored by the St Petersburg State University (SPbSU) and accepted by the editorial board of the *St Petersburg University Journal of Economic Studies* (SUJES).

Main provisions

1. All manuscripts submitted for publishing in the SUJES should be registered by the executive secretary stating the date of receipt. The decision on acceptance (stating the date of issue)/rejection/return for the revision is taken by the chief editor of the SUJES and communicated to the author no later than 60 days after the receipt of the manuscript.

2. All manuscripts (scientific articles, bibliography and dissertation reviews, etc.) submitted for publication in the SUJES are subject to a three-stage quality control procedure:

(1) **formal review** by the Board secretary of the SUJES (appropriateness to the journal, formal requirements, maximum number of pages, headings, structure, layout, key words, abstract in Russian and English languages, bibliography, correct use of figures and numeric data, formulas, calculations, equations, contact details, consent of the contributing authors for publication in the SUJES, etc.);

(2) **preliminary review** by the Editor-in-Chief and/or Executive editor (conformance of the article content to the topic stated in the heading, relevance and significance of the topic, scientific novelty, level of theoretical research, unauthorized or excessive citing of text, illustrations, tables, etc.);

(3) **substantial review** (anonymous/blind). All remarks made by the reviewer are forwarded to the author for consideration. The author shall respond to these comments point by point and present both the reviewed version of the article and a list of responses.

3. Formal and preliminary reviews to be held within **15 days** of the receipt of the manuscript by the editorial board of the SUJES. Should the manuscript be rejected after the preliminary review the author is to be informed in writing (by e-mail).

4. Manuscripts may be rejected at any stage of the review procedure. Members of the editorial board are informed of the manuscripts rejected after the first two review stages without further discussion. The author receives feedback of the board in writing by e-mail (see Appendix).

5. All manuscripts, not rejected after the first two stages, are subject to peer-review by at least two specialists in the sphere close to that of the submitted manuscript. The specialists should have either a scientific degree of a candidate or doctor of sciences awarded by the State Commission for Academic degrees and titles or leading Russian educational institutions, or an equivalent degree awarded by leading foreign institutions. The Editor-in-Chief of the SUJES can authorize additional review by previous or new reviewers, including manuscripts resubmitted by the authors after their revision.

6. Scientific review can be conducted by any qualified specialists, including the members of the editorial board of the Series 5 (with at least one reviewer not being an employee of the St Petersburg State University) provided there is no conflict of interests (prior relationship of subordination between the author and the reviewer, scientific supervision or co-authorship, etc.). The reviewer should inform the editorial board of the existence of the conflict of interests and withdraw from reviewing process. The author of the manuscript may indicate an objection to a reviewer.

7. Unless the reviewer agrees in writing, his personal details are not disclosed to the author.
8. After the peer review process the author receives a consolidated report with comments, recommendations for revision and publication conditions.
9. Peer review should provide answers to the following questions:
- (1) Whether the author of the manuscript is familiar with currently published theoretical research in the chosen economic field;
 - (2) How the manuscript relates to the existing literature, previously published data and current research in the field;
 - (3) Whether there is unauthorized or excessive citing of text or other violations of scientific ethics;
 - (4) Whether there is scientific novelty;
 - (5) Whether there is and if so, what is the practical application of the manuscript;
 - (6) how accurate is the text of the manuscript- whether the findings and the conclusions are in line with the presented data, if the manuscript meets the general and specific requirements regarding the structure of the publication, language and style, use of terminology, visualization of numeric data, diagrams, drawings and formulas, proper formatting of footnotes/endnotes, accuracy of bibliography, etc.;
 - (6) Whether the manuscript is of any interest for the reader.
10. Following the review the reviewer should:
- (1) Recommend the manuscript for publication as presented;
 - (2) Recommend the manuscript for publication with suggestion to consider the comments of the reviewer (at the discretion of the author);
 - (3) Recommend the manuscript for publication providing the author takes into account comments made by the reviewer and introduces changes;
 - (4) Reject the manuscript retaining the right of the author to resubmit the manuscript;
 - (5) Reject the manuscript without the right of resubmission.
11. The review can be made in the form of a table (see Appendix) with obligatory comments and recommendations.
12. **No more than two revisions** of the submitted manuscript are allowed. The manuscript resubmitted by the author four months later subsequent to the receipt of the review shall be considered to be submitted for the first time.
13. The editorial board of the Series 5 must ensure that the reviewer preserves confidentiality of any information concerning the manuscript submitted for review. The reviewer should confirm in writing the obligation not to disclose the existence of the manuscript and its content, personal details of the author, etc. The reviewer should not engage in discussions of the manuscript with third parties. The reviewers may not refer to the reviewed manuscripts before their publication.
14. Positive review is not the only requirement and does not directly result in the publication of the article. Final decision on the advisability of publication shall be taken by the editorial board and recorded in the meeting report.
15. The reviews shall be kept in the central editorial office of the St Petersburg State University (the original) and in the editorial office of the Journal (copy) **for 5 years** from the publication or rejection date. All reviews of published and rejected manuscripts shall be sent to the central editorial office of the St Petersburg State University together with the articles included in the latest edition of the SUJES. Failure to produce a complete set of reviews may lead to delays or discontinuing publishing of the issue.

CHECK LIST FOR REVIEWER

Review of article:

Please, use the following *ten point scale* to evaluate the reviewed article.

Score	Criteria
1. Topic justification	
	0-2 The article is a highly technical case study which is of no interest for the readers of the journal, or the article provides well-known solutions and introduces no new aspects 3-4 The problem at issue is neither relevant, nor important for the development of the theoretical apparatus or understanding or current processes 5-6 The problem at issue is actively discussed in scientific publications and the article presents author's point of view 7-8 The article deals with current economic issues, which are discussed in scientific publications 9-10 The article offers new solutions and modern approaches to the problem at issue, which is discussed in scientific publications
2. Clearly reported original hypothesis which is being proved in the article	
	0-3 There is no clear hypothesis 4-6 There is author's hypothesis, which, however, has analogues in other published articles, or the hypothesis is not clearly defined and cannot be proved or disproved 7-8 The author has identified the problem at issue, pointing at its unresolved and ambiguous aspects and providing possible solutions. However, the hypothesis is can neither be unequivocally proved nor disproved 9-10 The article provides a clear hypothesis which requires a proof. There exists necessary theoretical apparatus to prove or disprove original hypothesis
3. Level of the topic scientific development	
	0-3 Sporadic and formal review 4-6 The article considers mainstream research works, provides ready-made solutions 7-8 The article reviews key research works, identifies currently discussed issues 9-10 The article provides a detailed review of the problem at issue, identifies unresolved aspects
4. Theoretical and applied methods used by the author	
	0-3 The article lacks formal logic, there is no clear evidence base 4-6 The article is logical and provides statistic evidence and calculations 7-8 The article employs formal apparatus which allows to prove or disprove author's hypothesis 9-10 The article provides clear logical and/or formalized (in the form of econometric model) scheme of proof of the introduced propositions
5. Interpretation of obtained results	
	0-3 Findings are not directly connected with the problem at issue 4-6 There are well-founded conclusions, which, however, do not clearly prove or disprove author's hypothesis 7-8 There are well-founded conclusions which provide for the solution of the problem at issue 9-10 Findings have independent scientific significance
6. Reviewer's opinion (based both on the total score of _____ and non-quantitative arguments) – please, mark "√" for appropriate option.	
	The article is recommended for publication (41-50 points) The article is recommended for publication, with comments and recommendations of the reviewers being taken into account at the discretion of the author (31-40 points) The article is recommended for publication only after introducing changes in accordance with comments and recommendations of reviewers (21-30 points) The article is rejected with an opportunity to resubmit (15-20 points) The article is rejected with no opportunity to resubmit (less 15 points)
General opinion (<i>identification of strengths and (or) weaknesses of the article</i>), obligatory for filling out	

Recommendations for the author *(the section is obligatory, should the article be rejected or recommended for publication after introducing changes in accordance with comments made by reviewer)*

Additional comments for the editorial board

Reviewer (name, academic degree, position, place of employment, e-mail, signature) ¹:

_____ (signature)

« _____ » _____ 201____ г.

¹ Information for editorial office only.