



ALMANAC OF CLINICAL MEDICINE

PROCEDURE FOR PRELIMINARY CONSIDERATION AND REVIEWING OF MANUSCRIPTS SUBMITTED FOR PUBLICATION TO THE JOURNAL "ALMANAC OF CLINICAL MEDICINE"

1. An Executive Editor of the journal is responsible for acceptance and preliminary review of a submitted manuscript. He/she determines if the manuscript complies with the journal's profile and requirements to manuscript formatting.
2. Manuscripts that have not passed through preliminary selection process are rejected. The author is informed on the decision made.
3. Manuscripts that have passed through preliminary selection are sent for review. Reviewers are appointed by the Executive Editor.
4. Reviewing is done by members of the journal's editorial board.
5. The Publisher has the right to involve external reviewers from leading experts in the field working in areas of research that correspond to main topic of a manuscript.
6. Timeframe of reviewing is 15 working days. It may be prolonged at a reviewer's request, as well as if additional experts are necessary.
7. Manuscripts are sent to reviewers in a blinded manner, without giving author's names and coordinates.
8. Reviewers keep manuscripts strictly confidential and strictly follow an author's right for non-disclosure of information and data contained in the manuscript before publication. Additional experts may be invited by a reviewer only under permission of the publisher, provided they also keep confidentiality.
9. A review should contain a qualified analysis of the manuscript, objective and well-reasoned assessment and a sound conclusion on publication. A review is done in a written form as a free text, with highlights of the issues listed in the instruction for reviewers developed by the publisher. Based on his/hers well-reasoned judgement, a reviewer prepares a conclusion on further handling of the manuscript. The following decisions are possible: 1) the manuscript is recommended for publication a) as currently submitted, b) with corrections deemed necessary by a reviewer; 2) the manuscript should be sent for an additional review to another specialist; 3) to reject the manuscript.
10. In isolated cases, in accordance with a reviewer's recommendation, the Editor may send the manuscript for additional reviewing, including statistical and methodological one.
11. Author of a manuscript under consideration is given the possibility to read the text of a review, whereby neither name of a reviewer not his/hers contact information is shown.
12. If a review contains recommendations to change and modify the manuscript, the Executive Editor sends the review to the author suggesting to take the recommendations into account while preparing a new version of the manuscript or to reject them, partially or fully, with sound arguments. The manuscript, modified and/or corrected by an author, is sent for a second review.
13. Should unsolvable contradictions as per the manuscript arise between an author and a reviewer, the Editorial Board has the right to send the manuscript to another reviewer. In the case of a conflict, a manuscript may be sent for consideration to one of members of Editorial Board. In such cases, final decision is made by the Editor-in-Chief.

14. Manuscripts that were not recommended by reviewers for publication are not accepted for another consideration and/or review. An unfavorable conclusion of reviewing is sent to an author by e-mail, fax or post.
15. Availability of a positive review is not an adequate rationale for publication of a manuscript. Final decision on advisability of publication is made by the Editorial Board and, in conflicting cases, by the Editor-in-Chief.
16. Original reviews are kept in the editorial office for five years.
17. The journal's editorial board is continuously assessing quality of reviews by means of a Russian version of Review Quality Instrument (Version 3.2): van Rooyen S., Black N., Godlee F. J Clin Epidemiol 1999; 52:625–9.

MEMO TO A REVIEWER

While making an assessment of a manuscript and writing a review, a reviewer is recommended to consider the following:

1. If the title of a manuscript is in line with its contents
2. Relevance of the topic
3. If a manuscript is in line with start-of-the-art of the topic under study
4. If a work is original, data is new / the problem is fully and in a right way presented in a review of the literature
5. If aims and purposes of the work are clearly defined and are in line with actual data
6. If materials and methods are described fully and in detail
7. If the choice of study methods is adequate
8. If statistical analysis is adequate
9. If results correspond to the study aims
10. Availability of interpretation of data obtained
11. Validity of conclusions
12. Significance of results for research and science
13. Significance of results for practice
14. Use of visual methods for presentation of material (tables, figures)
15. If authors' own data have been compared to those in the literature
16. If references are given to all significant publications on the topic
17. Language and style of narration
18. Quality and size of the abstract
19. If the work complies with ethical norms