

## **Reviewing scientific articles submitted to the editorial office of the journal**

Expert opinion and review of manuscripts of scientific articles for publication in the “Philological Sciences Journal” are carried out in order to maintain a high scientific and theoretical level of publication and select the most valuable and relevant (promising) scientific works.

The expert commission has the right to reject materials and require the author(s) to bring them in accordance with the requirements for scientific articles.

In order to ensure the quality of published materials and compliance with copyright, all received materials are checked for borrowings. The program is checked by a responsible university employee - the “root administrator of the system”, and only after that they are sent for review.

Authors submitting their articles for publication in the journal “Philological Sciences Journal” thereby express their consent to the publication of the article, to the placement of meta-data of the article (titles, full names of authors and places of their affiliation, abstracts, keywords, bibliographic list) in the public domain on the journal’s website on the Internet, to transfer the text of the article (including links, bibliographic information, etc.) to persons and organizations whose provision of this information is mandatory, or to other persons in order to ensure the possibility citation of the publication and increase the citation index of the authors and the journal, and also confirm that the submitted articles have not been published in other journals and have not been submitted for publication to other journals.

The editors keep records of the review process of manuscripts.

The author(s) uploads (according to instructions) through the journal website [vestnik.korkyt.kz](http://vestnik.korkyt.kz) a scientific article, information about the authors compiled in three languages, annotations, an expert opinion of the article (from the place of work - in a free format - Appendix 1). The expert commission determines the compliance of the article according to the journal profile and formatting requirements

The editors, under the leadership of the editor-in-chief, check the compliance of the submitted article with the scientific direction, and a decision is made to accept or reject the article.

The executive secretary checks accepted articles in the anti-plagiarism program, after checking their compliance with the requirements specified in the technical design according to the instructions for authors. (The requirement for verification in the Anti-Plagiarism program is fully set out in the Rules for using the Anti-Plagiarism system.) An article whose authenticity exceeds 80% is sent for review.

The review procedure is carried out through an online system for submitting and reviewing articles, through “blind review” on a separate electronic site.

Reviewers are guided by the following rules:

- work in full accordance with the [editorial policy of the magazine](#), taking into account current legal requirements regarding libel, copyright, legality and plagiarism;
- do not use unpublished materials obtained from manuscripts submitted for consideration in personal research without the written consent of the author;

- comply with the review deadlines agreed with the responsible editors;
- notify the responsible editors and exclude yourself from the review process if you feel incompetent to review the research presented in the manuscript or believe that speedy review of the manuscript will not be possible.
- treat any material received for review as a confidential document, do not disclose its contents and do not discuss it with any persons other than the responsible editors;
- give an objective assessment of materials submitted for review. Reviewers must express their opinions clearly and with reason.
- draw the attention of members of the editorial board, executive editors of the series to any significant similarities or coincidences between the manuscript under consideration and any other published work.

**The review procedure includes the following steps:**

1. The article is sent for review to a Doctor of Science, Candidate of Science or PhD, whose scientific specialization is closest to the topic of the scientific article.
2. The time frame for reviewing an article may vary depending on the specific situation, but no more than 4 working weeks.
3. The reviewer cannot be the author or co-author of the work being reviewed, as well as scientific supervisors of applicants for an academic degree, PhD degree, and employees of the department in which the author works. Reviews are discussed by the editorial board and serve as the basis for accepting or rejecting manuscripts.
4. The review must objectively evaluate the scientific article and contain a comprehensive analysis of its scientific and methodological advantages and disadvantages. The review is prepared according to the standard form proposed by the editors (Appendix 1, table on the website).

The review should briefly evaluate:

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

Copies of the contents of the review are delivered to the author(s) within a week after the editorial office receives the expert opinion.

An article sent to the author for revision must be returned in a corrected form within 10 days with the corrections noted in the article.

The editors reserve the right to reject articles if the author is unable or unwilling to take into account the wishes of the editors.

The original reviews are kept by the editorial office of the Philological Sciences Journal for three years. Including for provision to competent authorities upon request.

Appendix 1

### Reviewing the article submitted to the «Philological Sciences Journal»

#### REVIEW

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

#### Content evaluation

##### *Study object*

<input type="checkbox"/>	Formulated clearly and accurately
<input type="checkbox"/>	Should be defined more clearly
<input type="checkbox"/>	Not clear, should be reformulated
Reviewer's comment:	

##### *Theoretical foundations and explanations*

<input type="checkbox"/>	The author expresses an original point of view
<input type="checkbox"/>	There are enough links to previous studies
<input type="checkbox"/>	Lack of links to other studies
<input type="checkbox"/>	The theoretical background is missing or unclear
Reviewer's comment:	

##### *Information and data provided*

<input type="checkbox"/>	New, original
<input type="checkbox"/>	Expand and supplement already known information
<input type="checkbox"/>	Repeat already known information
<input type="checkbox"/>	Obscure
Reviewer's comment:	

##### *Research method*

<input type="checkbox"/>	Well grounded and consistent
<input type="checkbox"/>	Insufficiently substantiated, should be reconsidered
<input type="checkbox"/>	Method unclear
<input type="checkbox"/>	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: