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Protocol # 17 of 21.01.2014

**REGULATIONS**

**On Peer-Reviewing**

**In the academic journal “Vestnik VGIK”**

1. **General Terms**
2. By Decision 17 of 21.01.2014 the “Vestnik VGIK” Editorial board has issued the following procedure of peer-reviewing the articles submitted for publication containing the basic academic results of doctoral dissertations in the following disciplines:

“Art History”;

“Philosophy”;

“Economics”

1. The manuscript should be presented in accordance with the regulations publically available on the journal’s website.
2. Each entry should be a complete text stating the relevance of the subject matter and its academic novelty, original in form and well-researched which has not been published elsewhere.
3. The originals of all the documents submitted by the authors (including reviews) are kept at the editorial office for five years.

**II. Rules of submitting reviews**

1. For post-graduate students, the article is accompanied by two reviews (internal and external) written by Doctors of Sciences in the relevant field in compliance with the Supreme Attestation Commission (VAK) Regulations (the signature is certified according to the established procedure and sealed by the place of employment), an extract from the minutes of the meeting of the sub-faculty or another academic division and a Post-Graduate Study Department’s certificate.
2. For **Ph.Ds** engaged in research at VGIK (faculty, researchers, Research Institute of Film Studies staff members), the review is submitted by the head of the academic or research division.
3. For **Ph.Ds** engaged in research **outside VGIK**, the article is accompanied by two reviews (internal and external) written by Doctors of Sciences in the relevant field in compliance with the Supreme Attestation Commission Regulations (the signature is certified according to the established procedure and sealed by the place of employment), an extract from the minutes of the meeting of the sub-faculty or another academic division recommending the article for publication. The review includes the complete title of the article, the author’s full name and position, a concise description of the subject matter, its relevance and novelty, a brief definition of the most essential academic issues covered in the article, a recommendation for publication, the reviewer’s name, degree, position, place of employment, the seal and signature, contact details.
4. For **Doctors of Sciences**, the reviews, an extract from the minutes of the meeting of the sub-faculty or another academic division are not required.
5. In view of encouraging **student** research activity, VGIK’s faculty and research divisions can recommend student papers for publication in “Vestnik”. For these publications, it is necessary to produce the extract from the minutes of the meeting of the sub-faculty or another academic division recommending the article for publication, reviews of one or two teachers, academic supervisor or a researcher (i.e. an internal review) and an external review by a Ph.D o DSc.
6. The following published papers are not to be reviewed: original reviews of new scholarly literature published in the section “Reading Room | Reviews”, information in the section “Reading Room | Bookshelf”, as well as the articles in the section “Case Study | Sidenotes”, panel minutes, news items in the section “Timeline | Current Events”.

**III. Blind Review Procedure**

1. All submitted manuscripts are subject to blind reviewing. The articles are reviewed by the Editorial board members (on a selective basis) and by an approved body of VGIK researchers. They employ a specific (brief) form of assessing the article’s academic merits. The reviews are kept at the Editorial office/Publishing house for 5 years.
2. Clauses 3-7 observed, the articles submitted for publication undergo internal double-blind reviewing by two anonymous experts without disclosing the author’s and reviewer’s names, which secures a greater objectivity of the decision on the quality of the article, the raised problem, its relevance and novelty. The reviewing is done by experts in the fields correlating with the subject matter of the article. The reviewers’ names are not divulged to the authors and the reviewers are notified of the fact that the submitted manuscripts are intellectual property of the authors and belong to classified information. The reviewers are not allowed to copy the manuscripts for their own needs.
3. The reviewing is confidential, all the details being kept at the editorial office. The review is classified and can be obtained by the author at his/her written request without disclosing the reviewer’s name and position. Breach of confidentiality is possible only if the reviewer claims the alleged inaccuracy or distortion of the facts stated in the manuscript.
4. In the case of any unforeseen (conflicting) situation related to the denial of publication on the part of the editors the review can be presented to the VAK Expert board at the written request.
5. If the reviewer makes remarks requiring the modification of the article, the manuscript is returned to the author with comments. The date of submitting the updated article is fixed anew, and the manuscript itself is classified as a new entry. Making comments on the modification and improvement of the text as well as the work with the authors is the exclusive province of the editors.
6. In case of a positive decision of the Editorial Board on the publication of the article, the author is notified by e-mail. If the decision is negative, the author receives a substantial written refusal.

**IV. Editorial Board’s Functions in Peer-Reviewing Procedure**

1. If the manuscript is recommended by the reviewer for publication it is considered at the session of the Editorial Board held every three months prior to assembling the next issue. The ultimate decision on the advisability of the publication is made by the Editorial board members which is recorded in the minutes of the session.
2. In the case when is rejected by one reviewer while being approved by the other (albeit with remarks) both the review and the manuscript are considered at the session of the Editorial Board preceding the assembling of the next issue. The Editorial Board retains the right to permit the publication if it has reasonable arguments recorded in the minutes. Besides, the Editorial Board can decide to give the controversial article to another expert in the same academic area for peer-reviewing.
3. In the case of two negative reviews on the same manuscript the issue is not to be considered by the Editorial Board but the editors can make the final decision and reject the manuscript giving the author a substantial written refusal.
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