

Peer-Review

1. The manuscript of the scientific article, received by the Editorial Board of the journal "**Koloproktologia**", is considered by the Executive Secretary for compliance with the profile of the journal, is registered by the issuing editor, the authors are notified by e-mail about the receipt of the article. If necessary, are indicated any inconsistencies with the requirements for the material of the article: the volume of the article, the number of illustrations, the presence of a summary in Russian and English, the presence of a list of references and the presence of a list of references in the text, contact information about the authors, etc. Authors are recommended to bring the manuscript of the article in accordance with the requirements at the stage before reviewing and submit it again.

2. The manuscripts are sent to two reviewers for evaluation.

3. All articles submitted to the editorial office are independently reviewed. Both members of the Editorial Board of the journal "Coloproctology" and third-party scientists and specialists who are experts in this field can be involved in reviewing manuscripts of articles as reviewers.

4. The review is confidential. Reviewers are notified that the submitted manuscripts are the private property of the authors and belong to the information not subject to disclosure.

5. If the review of the article contains an indication of the need for its correction, the article is sent to the author for revision. In this case, the date of receipt is the date of return of the revised article.

6. The original reviews are stored in the Editorial Board for five years from the date of publication of articles and upon request are provided to the expert councils of the HAC.

7. The article sent to the author for revision must be returned in corrected form within 3 months. The revised manuscript should be accompanied by a letter from the authors, containing answers to all the comments and explaining all the changes made in the article.

8. If the article on the recommendation of the reviewer has undergone significant author's processing, it is sent for re-review to the same reviewer who made critical comments.

9. The Editorial Board reserves the right to reject articles in case of inability or unwillingness of the author to take into account the wishes of the Editorial Board.

10. If there are negative reviews of the manuscript from two different reviewers or one review of its revised version, the article is rejected without consideration by other members of the Editorial Board.

11. In case of disagreement with the opinion of the reviewer, the author has the right to provide a reasoned response to the journal.

The article can be sent for re-reviewing or for approval to the Editorial Board.

12. The decision on expediency of the publication after reviewing is made by the Editorial Board.

13. The Executive Secretary shall bring the decision to the attention of the author. The maximum review period between the date of receipt of the manuscript and the date of decision making by Editorial Board is 4 months.

Rules for reviewing a scientific article

The task of reviewing is to promote strict selection of author's manuscripts for publication and offer specific recommendations for their improvement. The review should objectively evaluate the scientific article and contain a comprehensive analysis of its scientific and methodological advantages and disadvantages.