**THE PROCEDURE OF MANUSCRIPTS REVIEWING
IN THE JOURNAL "INFORMATICS AND APPLICATIONS"
(approved by the Deputy or the Editor-in-Chief of the journal
Academician Igor A.Sokolov, 22.06.2011)**

1. Manuscripts submitted to the journal are previously considered by the Editor-in-Chief, the Deputy or the Editor-in-Chief or the Executive Secretary of the journal.

2. The Editor-in-Chief (the Deputy or the Editor-in-Chief or the Executive Secretary of the journal) appoints a reviewer for any article (or, if necessary, two reviewers) from among the members of the Editorial Board or the leading specialists in this field of science. The term of any article reviewing should not exceed two weeks.

3. The format of the review is attached to this document

4. Received reviews should be submitted to the Editorial Board for sending to the authors (the reviewers' names should be concealed from authors)

5. If the review is positive and does not require modifications of the article, the article is submitted for considering of the editorial Board for publishing in the journal.

6. In case of need of refinement or rework of an article, an author (authors) should be notified about this, and after receiving a revised version of the text, the article is sent to the same reviewer (reviewers) for a new reviewing. If the reviewer is satisfied with the new text of article, he would notify about it the Executive Secretary of the journal without writing new review. If this case, the corrected article is submitted for considering of the Editorial Board for publishing in the journal.

7. Reviews are kept in the archive of the Editorial Board.

Prepared by the Executive Secretary of the journal, DrSc Sergey Ya. Shorgin, 22.06.2011

APP.
THE FORMAT OF THE REVIEW

The Journal "Informatics and Applications"

Review of the article

Authors:

Title:

(submitted in_____ [year]).

Reviewer: (name of the reviewer with the indicating academic degrees and academic title)

Estimates by individual indicators
(tick the right position)

	Very low or absent	Low	Satisfactory	Good	High
The degree of the author's familiarity with the current state of research					
The contents of the article to the journal topics					
Scientific novelty					
The validity of the results					
Applied and theoretical significance					
The quality of the reporting. The language of presentation					

Recommendations
(underline the right position)

Accept without revision
Accept with minor revision
Requires major revision and re-reviewing
Reject

Comments
(reviewer's comments, observations and recommendations)

Reviewer (name)