

**The procedure for reviewing articles for publication
in the republican scientific journal "QAZAQTANÝ"**
o organization and procedure for reviewing an article

Articles submitted by the author (authors) to the republican scientific journal "QAZAQTANÝ"

1.1. must be sent for double-blind peer review.

1.2. Articles not subject to review:

- members of the National Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Kazakhstan;

- recommended for publication by scientific congresses, symposia, conferences.

1.3. The reviewer is appointed by the editors of the journal from among the reviewers recommended by the editorial board of the journal in accordance with the scientific direction of the article.

1.4. The editorial board has the right to transfer the review of the article to leading experts.

1.5. The reviewer of the article cannot be its author (co-author).

1.6. The article in disputable cases can be sent for additional reviewing.

1.7. The article is sent to the author for revision in accordance with the comments of the reviewer (reviewers).

1.8. The decision on the possibility and expediency of publishing the article is made on the basis of the opinion of the reviewers and the decision of the Editorial Board of the journal.

1.9. The decision of the Editorial Board of the journal to publish or reject the article is reported to the author (authors).

1.10. A reasoned refusal is sent to the author (authors) of the rejected article upon written request.

2. Requirements for the structure and content of an article review

2. 1. The structure of the review of the article should include an assessment of:

- compliance of its content with the profile and subject of the journal;

- compliance of its content with the topic stated in the title;

- relevance, originality, novelty of the topic disclosed in it;

- compliance of the chosen methodology with the goals set in it;

- the validity of the formulation and depth of development of the problem under consideration;

- compliance of the topic, methods and results with modern achievements of scientific and technical thought;

- informativeness;

- theoretical integrity, the degree of structuring of the material presented in it;

- validity of the conclusions presented in it;

- practical significance of the scientific results presented in it.

2.2. The content of the article review should be:

- critical-analytical;
- reasoned;
- objective evaluation;
- advisory (for its improvement).

Review form

To the editorial board (name of the journal)

REVIEW

per article (article title)

The reviewer gives the following answers to the key review questions (yes / no):

Is the English translation correct and understandable?	
Is the work a substantial copy of another work? (checking the article for originality)	
Are the results of the study reliable?	
Was the research conducted in an ethical manner (surveys of minors and other situations)?	
Is the article original and interesting enough to be published?	
Does it make any contribution to the development of scientific knowledge?	
Is the research question important?	
Does the title clearly describe the article?	
Does the summary (abstract) reflect the content of the article?	
Are tables, graphs, illustrations appropriate?	
Are the calculations correct?	
Are previous investigators correctly identified?	
Are there properly formatted links to all citations?	
Does the conclusion match the content of the article?	

Theoretical and methodological remarks:

The article _____ is recommended for publication _____

(recommended or not recommended for publication; recommended with comments removed)

date _____

Reviewer _____

(accounting degree, position, place of work) (signature) (signature transcript)