

## PROCEDURE FOR SUBMITTING MANUSCRIPTS

to the peer-reviewed Collection of Papers

**“Nuclear propulsion reactor plants. Life cycle management technologies”**

All materials needed for manuscripts to be published in the peer-reviewed Collection of Papers should be sent **in electronic form** at e-mail [foton@niti.ru](mailto:foton@niti.ru), ([krykov@niti.ru](mailto:krykov@niti.ru)) (marked *“for the attention of the Editorial Board of the Collection of Papers”*).

The set of materials submitted to the Editorial Board of the Collection should include the following documents **in electronic form**:

- **text of manuscript** prepared in accordance with the **Manuscript Preparation Requirements** established by the Editorial Board;
- **copies of documents** certifying that the manuscript is cleared for public release and can be published in the Collection of Papers “Nuclear propulsion reactor plants. Life cycle management technologies”;
- **“License Agreement”** completed and signed by all co-authors.

Files with the license agreement template ([license\\_agreement.doc](#)) and manuscript preparation requirements ([Manuscript preparation requirements.doc](#)) are available on website [www.niti.ru](http://www.niti.ru), section **“Collection of Papers”**.

The duly prepared and signed by all the authors license agreement (original hard copy) should be sent to the Editorial Board of the Collection of Papers at the address: FSUE “Alexandrov NITI”, 72 Koporskoye shosse, Sosnovy Bor, Leningrad region, 188540 Russia (marked **“for the attention of the Editorial Board of the Collection of Papers”**).

Information about the Collection of Papers and reviewing procedure, manuscript preparation and submission requirements are available at the website [www.niti.ru](http://www.niti.ru), section “the Collection of Papers “Nuclear propulsion reactor plants. Life cycle management technologies”

## **GUIDELINES**

for reviewing manuscripts submitted for publication in the Collection of Papers  
“Nuclear propulsion reactor plants. Life cycle management technologies”

### **1. General**

1.1. The Collection publishes papers and short contributions that report results of theoretical and experimental research carried out as part of the activities for development, testing, and operation of nuclear propulsion reactor plants throughout their life cycle.

1.2. All materials (scientific articles, information notices, etc.) submitted for publication in the Collection are peer reviewed.

1.3. These guidelines establish a procedure for reviewing manuscripts, notices, and other materials submitted to the Editorial Board of the Collection.

1.4. The institution of reviewing is an expert body comprised of the Editorial Board members and leading experts of organizations, universities, and science centers in Russia.

1.5. The Editorial Board together with the Directorate of FSUE “Alexandrov Research Institute of Technology” provides for organizational and financial support to the review process.

1.6. The statute of the institution of reviewing is discussed at the Editorial Board meeting and approved by the Editor-in-Chief.

### **2. Purpose and tasks of reviewing**

2.1. The purpose of peer reviewing is to ensure a high scientific level of materials (papers, notices, etc.) submitted for publication in the Collection of Papers “Nuclear propulsion reactor plants. Life cycle management technologies”.

2.2. The tasks of peer reviewing are:

- objective assessment of the importance, originality, and practical value of the contents of materials submitted for publication in the Collection;
- justified refusal of acceptance for poorly prepared manuscripts of low scientific value;
- preparation of justified recommendations to the Editorial Board for their decision-making on suitability and priority of manuscripts for publication.

### **3. Review requirements**

3.1. Reviews should emphasize the following:

- importance, originality and/or practical value of the study reported in the paper and (if possible) its comparison with similar domestic and foreign studies;
- originality of the approach;
- integrity of the experiment and reproducibility of results (for applied research);
- correctness of experimental data interpretation, their agreement with theory;
- correctness and unambiguity of conclusions, their foundation in the text, and correspondence to the paper’s concepts;
- informational value of figures and tables, their relevance and appropriateness with respect to the mechanisms and phenomena described in the paper;

- familiarity of the author(s) with the state-of-the art (e.g. references to the most recent publications).

3.2. Reviewers can give, if needed, other comments and recommendations to the author(s) as to how the paper can be improved.

3.3. The conclusion of the review report should include recommendation such as “the manuscript is **recommended for publication**”, “the manuscript is **recommended for publication with revisions**” or “the manuscript is **not recommended for publication**”.

#### **4. Assignment of reviewers**

4.1. The body of reviewers for the Collection of Papers “Nuclear propulsion reactor plants. Life cycle management technologies” consists of highly qualified voluntary and independent experts in the subject field of the Collection.

4.2. Manuscripts from post-graduate students and doctoral candidates shall be previously reviewed by their thesis advisors with academic degree of PhD or Doctor of Science. If at least one co-author on a paper has an academic degree, **no** review and comment by thesis advisors **is required**.

4.3. The Editor-in-Chief or the Deputy Editor-in-Chief or a competent member of the Editorial Board on behalf of the Editor-in-Chief will assign a reviewer to the paper.

4.4. In case of a conflict, a new reviewer can be assigned to re-review the paper. The Editor-in-Chief or the Deputy Editor-in-Chief considers the comments of the first reviewer and decides whether a new review of the paper is needed and a second reviewer should be assigned to the paper. The reason for re-review can be the authors’ justified objections to the comments received from the first reviewer.

#### **5. Reviewing procedure (organization and review deadlines)**

5.1. All manuscripts submitted to the Collection of Papers are peer-reviewed on an anonymous basis.

5.2. The Executive Secretary of Editorial Board organizes communication between authors of papers and reviewers. The Executive Secretary of Editorial Board:

- handles the review procedure: e-mails, posts or faxes manuscripts to assigned reviewers for review and files reviews received for manuscripts;
- informs the Editor-in-Chief and Editorial Members about review results;
- on behalf of the Editor-in-Chief, maintains correspondence with authors and reviewers on all outstanding issues;
- manages resolution of disputes and conflicts between authors and reviewers;
- informs in writing the author(s) about the review result and Editorial Board decision on whether the paper is accepted, should be revised and resubmitted, or is rejected.

5.3. The review due date is set as agreed with the reviewer (the deadline cannot be longer than two weeks plus time taken for mailing). If the reviewer misses the deadline without good reason, he (she) shall return the manuscript to the Editorial Board and a new reviewer shall be assigned.

5.4. Review is written on pages of A4 format and signed by the reviewer; the signed review (one copy) along with the reviewed manuscript is sent by post, e-mail or fax at the address of the Editorial Board of the Collection (to the attention of the Executive Secretary).

5.5. If only minor or no criticism on the paper is made, the review can be drawn up in accordance with **the template** in Annex.

5.6. If more than one manuscript of the same author is reviewed at the same time, an individual review for each manuscript is prepared.

5.7. Reviewers' critical comments (if any) in writing are provided to the authors on an anonymous basis. If the authors have objections to the comments, they prepare reasoned answers and submit them in writing to the Executive Secretary of the Editorial Board. The recommended answer (objection) format is a revised version of the manuscript with two documents: the list of answers to reviewers' comments and a cover letter to the Editor-in-Chief of the Collection.

5.8. If the manuscript is rejected for publication, the Editorial Board informs the author of the decision with reasons in writing; the decision is signed by the Editor-in-Chief or the Deputy Editor-in-Chief.

5.9. The author has the right to receive from the Editorial Board (at the written request sent to the address of the Editor-in-Chief) the review of his (her) paper, but with no reviewer signature, name, position, and affiliation.

5.10. Any disputes and conflicts between authors and reviewers shall be resolved in due course by the Editor-in-Chief or the Deputy Editor-in-Chief. In some complicated cases it may be necessary to submit disputes and conflicts for consideration and resolution at a meeting of the Editorial Board members.

5.11. The content of each issue of the Collection is discussed at the Editorial Board meeting where a decision on acceptance for publication is made for each paper, taking reviewers' opinions into account. The Editorial Board's decision on the content of the Collection issue shall be approved by the Editor-in-Chief or the Deputy Editor-in-Chief.

5.12. After the content of the Collection issue has been approved, the Executive Secretary informs the authors of the decision and the publication date.

5.13. The Editorial Board stores the minutes of its meetings and the original reviews for 5 years.

These Guidelines were approved by the Editor-in-Chief of the Collection of Papers "Nuclear propulsion reactor plants. Life cycle management technologies", Dr. V.A. Vasilenko, on April 7, 2015.

## Peer-reviewed periodical collection of papers

“Nuclear Propulsion Reactor Plants. Life Cycle Management Technologies”

(Review report template)

Dear \_\_\_\_\_,

*The Editorial Board of the Collection of Papers requests you to review the manuscript of the paper*

<u>Title of paper</u>	
<u>Author(s)</u>	

*and give recommendation as whether the paper is worthy of publication in the Collection of Papers “Nuclear Propulsion Reactor Plants. Life Cycle Management Technologies”.*

*Please answer the following questions and provide comments, if any:*

Question	Answer (yes/no)
*Is the manuscript in the subject area of the Collection?	
Is the title of the paper consistent with the content of the paper?	
Is the paper’s subject of current importance?	
Is the paper novel from the scientific point of view and/or has it a practical scientific value? The level of a practical scientific value ( <u>low, medium, high</u> ). <small>Strike out whichever is not applicable</small>	
Is the paper abstract consistent with the paper’s content?	
Is the material presented coherently and clearly?	
Does the manuscript contain enough theoretical, experimental and/or statistical data to support the conclusions reached?	
Are the conclusions adequately exact and firm, coherent with the text and relevant to the subject matter of the paper?	
Are references consistent with the content of the manuscript?	
Does the paper contain references to up-to-date literature (state-of-the-art papers)?	
Is the quality of the manuscript text satisfactory?	
Is the quality of figures and illustrations satisfactory?	
Is the quality of tables satisfactory?	

If you cannot answer yes to any of the above questions, please provide additional comments for the author(s) and Editorial Board.

If you have suggestions or recommendations for the author(s) to improve the paper or the study presented in the paper, please provide them below.

In my opinion, this manuscript of the paper:

<u>Title of paper</u>	
<u>Author(s)</u>	

**Can be published as an article** in the Collection of Papers “Nuclear Propulsion Reactor Plants. Life Cycle Management Technologies”:

with no changes or corrections

\*after minor corrections of the manuscript material as follows:

\*(describe requirements for correction of the paper manuscript)

\*after introduction of significant corrections and revision of the manuscript material:

\*(describe requirements for revision of the paper)

\* **Cannot be published**

\*(you may give reasons why you do not recommend the manuscript for publication)

\* mark the appropriate line (please provide explanation, if possible).

Reviewer:

\_\_\_\_\_

(Name)

\_\_\_\_\_

(Position, academic degree (if any))

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

*(The review report shall be certified subject to any procedure accepted in the reviewer's organization)*

Please send the signed copy of the review report **by mail or by fax** to the Editorial Board (**or send the scan copy of the signed review report by e-mail to the Editorial Board**).