

REGULATIONS
ON PEER REVIEW OF MANUSCRIPTS SUBMITTED FOR PUBLISHING
IN COLLECTED RESEARCH PAPERS
“CONTEMPORARY ISSUES OF CONCRETE AND REINFORCED
CONCRETE”

These Regulations On Peer Review of Manuscripts are developed in accordance with the requirements for the Collected Research Papers being reviewed, which are included in the Catalogue of Scientific Publications of the Republic of Belarus for publishing the Results of Thesis Research, and the requirements of the Regulations on Collected Research Papers “Contemporary Issues of Concrete and Reinforced Concrete” and determine the procedure for peer review of manuscripts received by the Editorial Board of the Collected Research Papers “Contemporary Issues of Concrete and Reinforced Concrete” (hereinafter referred to as “the Editorial Board of Collected Papers”).

1. An author submits an article manuscript to the Editorial Board of Collected Papers, and the article manuscript must be prepared in accordance with the requirements of the Regulations On the Collected Research Papers “Contemporary Issues of Concrete and Reinforced Concrete” and general requirements on the authors for formatting their article manuscripts submitted for publishing in the Collected Papers, which can be found on the website of Institute BelNIIS RUE (<http://www.belniis.by/en/>).

The article manuscripts submitted are electronically registered by the members of the Working Group of Collected Papers.

2. For the purpose of independent peer review, all manuscripts received by the Editorial Board are submitted for peer review to one of the members of the Editorial Board or an independent expert (reviewer), who is a leading expert in the scientific field concerned, according to their scientific research profile. Manuscripts may be reviewed by Doctors or Candidates of Science. Moreover, one reviewer may review either a single article or a series of articles united by one scientific topic.

3. To all manuscripts received by the Editorial Board of Collected Papers, a double-blind review method is applied, in which a reviewer’s name is concealed from a manuscript author, while the name of a manuscript author is concealed from a reviewer.

4. In order to maintain confidentiality, the Chair of Editorial Board directly appoints a reviewer, and the Secretary of Editorial Board interacts with the reviewer during organising and reviewing manuscripts.

5. No breach of confidentiality may occur unless a reviewer states that the materials given in an article are incorrect or falsified.

6. If it is necessary for the Chair of the Editorial Board to delegate his/her powers to appoint reviewers to the Deputy Chair of the Editorial Board or to one of the members of the Editorial Board, Institute BelNIIS RUE issues an order indicating the scope and duration of the powers being delegated.

7. If an article has been successfully presented at scientific, scientific and technical, scientific and methodological councils of scientific organisations and

higher educational institutions and is given a written opinion of the Council with a recommendation to publish, such an article may be accepted without being submitted for peer review.

8. No experts working at the same scientific research institution or higher educational institution, where the paper was written, are involved in peer review.

9. Reviewers are informed that the manuscripts sent to them are private property of their authors and classified as restricted information. Reviewers shall not to make any copies of articles for their own needs.

10. In addition to an article manuscript, a reviewer receives a review form, a list of scientific fields of the Collected Papers, and requirements on authors for preparing their article manuscripts submitted for publishing in the Collected Papers.

11. A reviewer performs peer review according to the form proposed (Appendix 1) or in free form, in which he/she draws his/her opinion on whether the article may be published.

The reviewing period is agreed with the Editorial Board of Collected Papers.

12. A reviewer sends his/her peer review to the Editorial Board by email or by regular post in an envelope.

13. The Editorial Board informs an author on the results of peer review by email.

14. The author of the paper reviewed is given an opportunity to read the peer review text in case he/she disagrees with the reviewer's conclusion; in case the reviewer has remarks and recommendations on corrective measures; in other cases, at the discretion of the Editorial Board.

15. If the peer review of an article contains instructions on its correction, the article is sent to the author for follow-up revision, with the term for correction specified. In this case, the date of receipt for editing is the date when the corrected article is returned. Thereafter, the article may be submitted for a second peer review or for agreement to the Editorial Board.

16. The members of the Editorial Board make a decision to publish based on the results of peer review according to a conciliatory principle.

17. Since the scientists sitting on the Editorial Board are from different countries, they can use email to express their opinion of the article manuscripts received by the Editorial Board and send their recommendations on whether the articles may be published.

18. The Chair of the Editorial Board takes the final decision to publish the article manuscripts (taking into account the recommendations given by the members of the Editorial Board and received by email).