Expert opinion and review of scientific articles submitted to the editorial office

Review of manuscripts of scientific articles for publication of journal «Chemistry and Chemical Technology» are carried out in order to maintain a high scientific and theoretical level of publication and selection of the most valuable and relevant (perspective) scientific works.

Expert opinion and review of manuscripts of scientific articles for publication in the journal " Chemistry and Chemical Technology " are carried out in order to maintain a high scientific and theoretical level of the publication and select the most significant and relevant (promising) scientific works.

The Reviewers may reject the materials and require the author(s) to bring them in accordance with the requirements of the scientific articles.

In order to ensure the quality of published materials and respect for copyright, all received materials are checked for borrowing. The verification of the program is carried out by the responsible employee of the university - «root administrator of the system», and only then are sent for review.

The authors, who send their articles for publication in the journal «Topical issues of teaching mathematics, physics and information sciences journal», express their consent to the publication of the article, to the placement of metadata of the article (full name author's and places of their affiliation, annotations, keywords, bibliographic list) in public access to the journal's website on the Internet, to transmit the text of the article (including links, bibliographic information, etc.) to persons and organizations to whom the information is obligatory, or to others in order to allow citation of the publication and to increase the index of citation of authors and journal, and confirm that the submitted articles were not published in other journals or submitted for publication in other journals.

The editorial office keeps a record of the passing of manuscripts procedure of expert evaluation and review.

The author uploads (according to the instructions) through the site of the journal https://vestnik.korkyt.kz scientific article. The editorial board under the supervision of the chief editor checks the compliance to the scientific direction of the article submitted to the editorial office, and a decision is made on the acceptance or rejection of the article.

The responsible secretary checks the accepted articles in the program of antiplagiarism, after checking their compliance with the requirements specified in the technical design according to the instructions for authors. (The verification requirement in the program Antiplagiarism is fully described in the Rules of use of the system «Antiplagiarism».) The article, whose authenticity exceeds 80%, is sent for review.

The review procedure is carried out through the online submission and review system of articles, through «blind review» by a separate electronic site.

Reviewers are guided by the following rules:

- to work in full compliance with the editorial politics of the journal, taking into account the actual legal requirements regarding libel, copyright, legality and plagiarism;

- not to use unpublished materials obtained from submitted manuscripts for examination in personal research without written consent of the author;

- comply with review deadlines agreed with the responsible editors;

- notify the responsible editors and exclude yourself from the review process, feeling incompetent to review the research presented in the manuscript, or believing that a speedy review of the manuscript will be impossible.

- to consider any material received for review as a confidential document, not to disclose its contents and not to discuss with any persons other than responsible editors;

- to give an objective assessment of the materials submitted for review. Reviewers should express their opinion clearly and reasoned.

- to draw the attention of the editors-in-chief of the series to any significant similarities or coincidences between the manuscript in question and any other published work.

The review procedure includes the following steps:

1. The article is sent for review to the Doctor of Sciences, the Candidate of Sciences or PhD, whose scientific specialization is most close to the subject of the scientific article.

2. The review period may vary depending on the specific situation, but not more than 2 working weeks.

3. The reviewer cannot be the author or co-author of the peer-reviewed work, as well as the scientific supervisors of the candidate academic degree, PhD degree and employees of the department in which the author works. Reviews are discussed by the editorial board and serve as a basis for acceptance or rejection of manuscripts.

4. The review should objectively assess the scientific article and contain a comprehensive analysis of its scientific and methodical advantages and disadvantages. The review is based on the standard proposed revision (Annex 1).

In the review should be briefly evaluated:

- general scientific level of work;
- the title and its correspondence to the content of the article;
- relevance of the topic;
- scientific novelty,
- the practical significance of the presented conclusions;
- work structure;
- debating and/or incorrect provisions;
- the positive aspects or shortcomings of the article are noted, what corrections and additions should be made by the author;
- the reviewer's opinion on the possibility or impossibility of publishing the manuscript is stated.

Copies of the content of the review shall be communicated to the author(s) within a week after the editorial office received the expert opinion.

The article sent to the author for revision must be returned in the corrected form within 10 days with the corrections marked in the article.

The editorial broad reserves the right to reject the articles in case of inability or unwillingness of the author to take into account the wishes of the editorial broad.

The originals of the reviews are kept in the editorial office of the journal «Chemistry and Chemical Technology», for three years. Including to be made available to competent authorities upon request.

Annex 1

«Chemistry and Chemical Technology» journal reviewing the article submitted to the republican scientific methodical journal

REVIEW

Article title:	
Reviewer: Full name, academic degree and title, position	
Date:	

Content evaluation

Study object

	Formulated clearly and accurately
	Should be defined more clearly
	Not clear, should be reformulated
Reviewer's comment:	

Theoretical foundations and explanations

	The author expresses an original point of view
	There are enough links to previous studies
	Lack of links to other studies
	The theoretical background is missing or unclear
Reviewer's comment:	

Information and data provided

	New, original
	Expand and supplement already known information
	Repeat already known information
	Obscure
Reviewer's comment:	

Research method

	Well grounded and consistent
	Insufficiently substantiated, should be reconsidered
	Method unclear
	Not required for this kind of work
Reviewer's comment:	

Problem solving and analysis of results

	Very well grounded
	Reasonable enough
	Poorly grounded, should be revisited
	Not clear and / or too abstract
	Descriptive work
Reviewer's comment:	

Evaluation form

Name

	Clear and precise
	Should be revised
Reviewer's comment:	

Language style

	A great
	Free enough
	Understandable
	Hard to understand
Reviewer's comment:	

Tables, graphs, etc.

	Acceptable
	Should be revised
	Missing / not required
Reviewer's comment:	

List of used literature

	Acceptable
	Should be edited
Reviewer's comment:	

Annotation

	Acceptable
	Should be edited
	Should be revised
Reviewer's comment:	

Conclusions

	Publish as provided

	Accept with minor changes
	Accept with significant changes
	Reject as it stands, but with the possibility of re-filing
	Reject without the possibility of re-filing

Reviewer's comment: