All the articles are reviewed.

The procedure of reviewing is focused on the most objective assessment of the scientific article’s content, identification of its compliance with the journal. Also reviewing provides a comprehensive analysis of advantages and disadvantages of article materials. Only those articles that are valuable from a scientific point of view and contribute to solving actual educational problems are accepted for publication.

**The main purpose of the review procedure** is to eliminate cases of substandard practice research and to ensure coordination and adherence to balance of the interests of authors, readers, editorial board, reviewers, institution which carried out the research. Reviewers evaluate the theoretical and methodological level of the article, its practical value and scientific importance. In addition compliance of the article to the principles of ethics in scientific publications and recommendations for eliminating of violations are determined by reviewers.

**STAGES FOR REVIEWING**

1. The submitted articles to the editorial board should meet the requirements of the journal policy.

2. Checking the article for the degree of uniqueness copyright text. For all articles which are provided for reviewing, the degree of uniqueness copyright text is determined using [appropriate software program Unichek.](https://unicheck.com/)

3. All manuscripts submitted to Editorial Board are directed to the profile of research to reviewers.

4. For reviewing of the articles as reviewers may act independent high-qualified professionals who have profound professional knowledge, experience in a particular scientific direction and research on the specialty.

5. Reviewer concludes the possibility of publishing the article usually within 14 days (fills in a standardized form, which contains a summary of recommendations).

6. Reviewing is held in confidence by the principles of double-blind reviewing (two-way «blind» review, when neither the author nor the reviewer do not know each other). The interaction between author and reviewers occurs through the editor of the journal.

7. If the reviewer points to the need to make certain articles corrections, the article is sent to the author with the offer to consider the comments in the preparation of an updated version of the article or to refute them reasonably. Into a revised article, the author adds the letter, which contains answers to all comments and explains all the changes that were made in the article. Revised version is given to a reviewer again for the decision and prepare a reasoned conclusion about the possibility of publication.

8. Reviewers recommend the possibility of publishing an article:

* to publish without changes;
* to publish provided further follow-up revision of the article by the author;
* to publish after a significant revision of the article by the author;
* to reject the article on the whole.

9. The final decision on the possibility and expediency of the publication is adopted by the meeting of the editorial board.