

The regulation was approved by the editor-in-chief of the Journal of Oceanological Research, Professor A.G. Kostianoy and agreed with the founder-publisher (IO RAS), director of IO RAS, Corresponding Member of RAS A.V. Sokov January 15, 2020

REGULATION

about peer review of scientific articles in the Journal of Oceanological Research

1. General Provisions

1.1. This Regulation on the review of scientific articles determines the procedure and procedure for reviewing the author's original articles (materials) received by the editors of the scientific Journal of Oceanological Research (hereinafter referred to as the Journal).

1.2. Reviewing (peer review) of manuscripts of scientific articles in the editorial office of the journal is carried out in order to ensure and maintain a high scientific and technical level of the publication and in order to select the most valuable and relevant (perspective) scientific papers.

1.3. All materials submitted for publication in the journal are subject to review.

1.4. The following basic concepts are used in this Regulation:

The **author(s)** is a person or a group of persons (a team of authors) involved in the creation of an article based on the results of a scientific study.

The **editor-in-chief** is the person who heads the Editorial Board and makes the final decisions regarding the production and release of the journal. The editor-in-chief carries out general, scientific and scientific-methodical management of the Editorial Board.

The **conscientious self-quoting** is the reuse by the author of his own texts from earlier works in an amount justified by the purpose of quoting, with reference to the source, drawn up in accordance with the established citation rules.

The **conscientious self-quoting in an incorrect form** is the reuse by the author of his own texts from earlier works in an amount justified by the purpose of quoting and with reference to the source, drawn up in violation of the established citation rules. For example, the link is put down to the wrong source, is in the wrong place, does not show the citation boundaries.

The **duplicate publication** is a complete republishing of an article in another publication without reference to the first publication or simultaneous publication of an article in different publications.

The **head of the Editorial Board** - a person who heads the Editorial Board, carries out the production process, financial and economic activities, as well as personnel management.

The **publisher** - a legal entity or subdivision of the Founder, acting on behalf of the Founder, whose structure includes the Editorial Board of the journal.

The **executive secretary of the Editorial Board** - a specialist who organizes and controls the internal editorial work on planning, timely and high-quality preparation of journal materials for publication.

The **re-publication (reprint)** - a complete republishing of a previously published work, issued with a footnote indicating the source and obtaining permission to reprint from the publisher (copyright holder) of the previous work.

The **plagiarism** is the deliberate appropriation of the authorship of someone else's work of science or art, someone else's ideas or inventions. Plagiarism may be a violation of copyright, patent law and as such may result in legal liability.

The **paraphrase** (rewriting) - processing the source text while maintaining the original meaning by changing the syntactic structure of sentences, replacing word forms (number, person, time, etc.), replacing words with synonyms, replacing the terms used to similar ones, changing the order of words, sentences, etc. The resulting text is called a rewrite. The main features of rewriting is the preservation of the sequence of thoughts and the approximate volume of the original text.

The **editor** - a representative of a scientific journal or publishing house who prepares materials for publication, as well as maintains communication with authors and readers of scientific publications.

The **Editorial team** is an advisory body from a group of authoritative persons who assists the editor-in-chief in the selection, preparation and evaluation of works for publication.

The **Editorial Board** is a scientific and auxiliary subdivision within the structure of the Founder's Publishing House, carrying out the entire process of planning, collecting, controlling, reviewing, typesetting and preparing manuscripts and the journal for publication.

The **reviewer** - an expert acting on behalf of a scientific journal or publishing house and conducting a scientific examination of copyrighted materials in order to determine the possibility of their publication.

The **reviewing** is a procedure for reviewing and peer review of a scientific article proposed for publication in order to determine the feasibility of its publication, identify its advantages and disadvantages, which is important for the improvement of the manuscript by the author and the editors.

The **self-plagiarism** (unscrupulous self-quoting) is the reuse by the author of his own texts from earlier works without reference to the source or in an amount not justified by the purpose of quoting.

2. The procedure for the submission and initial consideration of the article

2.1. The Editorial Board of the journal accept for consideration articles and materials reflecting scientific views, results and achievements of fundamental and theoretical and applied research in the fields of knowledge corresponding to the headings of the journal. Materials that do not correspond to the topics of the listed subject areas are not accepted for consideration.

2.2. The author submits the materials and the manuscript through the personal account of the official WEB - portal of the journal: jor.ocean.ru. To do this, the author needs to go through voluntary registration: <https://jor.ocean.ru/index.php/jor/user/register>, during which the author gets acquainted with:

- with the privacy policy and accepts it as a necessary condition for submitting manuscript materials: <https://jor.ocean.ru/index.php/jor/navigationMenu/view/privacy-policy>;
- with the publication ethics <https://jor.ocean.ru/index.php/jor/navigationMenu/view/cope-code-of-conduct>, adopted by the journal;
- terms and volume of personal data processed: <https://jor.ocean.ru/index.php/jor/navigationMenu/view/personal-data>;
- with a user agreement - an offer agreement in accordance with Part 2 of Art. 437 of the Civil Code of the Russian Federation: <https://jor.ocean.ru/index.php/jor/navigationMenu/view/user-agreement>.

2.3. Subject to acceptance of the terms and agreement with the Journal's policy, the author receives an account and password to enter the Journal's portal in his personal account, uploads the manuscript materials and immediately receives a registration number and an e-mail notification of acceptance of the manuscript materials. The author uses the login and password

in the future when interacting with the Editorial Board of the Journal and the Reviewers. The author can also submit an article through e-mail channels to the address: jorboard@ocean.ru. In this case, the author receives a notification of acceptance of the article no earlier than 5 working days after checking the received materials in the order of manual control.

2.4. The materials received from the authors undergo primary control for compliance with the journal's subject, completeness and correctness of design. In case of incompleteness or non-compliance with the requirements of the Journal, the author is notified by a letter-message sent by the Editorial Board by e-mail.

2.5. The materials are accepted for further consideration by the Editorial Board of the Journal, provided that they meet the requirements for the author's original articles (materials) posted on the journal's website at: https://jor.ocean.ru/public/doc/Author_guidelines_rus.pdf.

2.6. The author(s) submit to the editors a carefully proofread manuscript of the article in electronic form at <https://jor.ocean.ru/index.php/jor/user/register> or e-mail jorboard@ocean.ru in the following set:

- a carefully proofread copy of the article, drawn up in accordance with the requirements for publications, previously not published anywhere and containing a bibliographic list of references;
- abstract (in Russian and English), key words and phrases - in Russian and English;
- high quality drawings presented as separate files in tiff, jpg graphic formats;
- a letter of consent to the publication of the article (Appendix No. 1);
- a license agreement for the right to use the work;
- expert opinion (lack of restrictive stamp);

Document templates are provided at the following URL:

<https://jor.ocean.ru/index.php/jor/navigationMenu/view/authors>.

2.7. The materials of the article should be open. The presence of a restrictive stamp serves as a basis for rejecting the material from open publication.

2.8. The manuscript of a scientific article received by the Editorial Board of the journal is considered by the executive secretary for the completeness of the package of submitted documents and the compliance of the manuscript (article) with the requirements of the Editorial Board, the profile of the journal and the rules of registration. In case of non-compliance with the conditions of registration, the article can be sent to the author for revision.

2.9. Materials that do not correspond to the subject of the journal, or are designed in violation of the rules for preparing manuscripts, are returned to the authors with an indication of the reasons for refusal to accept manuscripts.

3. Order and procedure for reviewing manuscripts

3.1. The Journal of Oceanological Research conducts a thorough review of all submitted manuscripts [1]. Selected materials such as news releases, obituaries, etc. may be published without reviews, but on the recommendation of the editor-in-chief, deputy editor-in-chief, member of the editorial board or executive editor of the issue. The editorial board of the journal in its activities follows the ethical standards of the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE Code of Conduct) <https://publicationethics.org/>. [2].

3.2. To ensure an independent and transparent process between authors and reviewers, double-blind peer review is carried out.

3.3. The review involves scientists and specialists with recognized authority and working in the field of knowledge, which includes the content of the manuscript and having scientific publications on the subject of the reviewed article. The reviewer, as a rule, must have an academic degree of Doctor of Science, Candidate of Science or Master of Science in the relevant specialty.

3.4. Reviewers are invited through the system of electronic interaction of the official website of the journal. The Editor-in-Chief, Deputy Editor-in-Chief, or Executive Editor of the issue sends a request to two reviewers selected from a database of independent scientists who are experts in the subject matter of the peer-reviewed material and have published on it within the last five years.

3.5. The journal has adopted a four-level system of reviewing articles:

Level 1 - checking the text of the article for the presence of borrowed text - is **mandatory for all articles**. The editors of the journal check all articles through the Antiplagiarism system. If the originality of the text is below 85% (in this case, borrowings from one source cannot be more than 7%), the article is sent to the author for revision with the appropriate justification. **The reviewer needs to distinguish conscientious self-citation from self-plagiarism, paraphrase and plagiarism** [3]. If the former is allowed, then self-plagiarism and plagiarism are not allowed. Definitions of terms are presented in clause 1.4 of this Regulation.

Level 2 - double blind peer review (double-blind - the author and reviewers do not know about each other) is used to eliminate the ambiguous characterization of the article by one reviewer. The article is immediately sent simultaneously to two independent reviewers. In case of receiving conflicting expert opinions, the article is sent to **the 3rd level** of review.

Level 3 - an additional two-sided "blind" review is performed (double-blind - the author and reviewers do not know about each other) by the third reviewer - **mandatory for all articles that received two conflicting reviews at the 2nd level**.

Level 4 - performed in the case of an ethically conflicting and / or controversial situation. The editors together with the editorial board of the journal can recommend the article for additional open review. All the results of the review are considered at a meeting of the Editorial Board of the Journal, the decision is made in accordance with Art. 4 of this Regulation.

3.6. The reviewer evaluates the article for relevance of the topic and scientific novelty, as well as its structure and presentation style. All remarks and wishes to the article are made out in the review (Appendix 2). If the comments made by the reviewer can be eliminated, then the article is sent to the author for revision. The editors of the journal reserve the right to refuse publication to the author who wishes to ignore the reviewer's comments. The reviewer has the right to conduct an additional check for the use of borrowings in the text of the publication by selectively copying parts of the text and checking through available Internet search engines;

3.7. The reviewer must consider the article sent to him within the established time limits and send to the editorial office by e-mail either a properly executed review or a reasoned refusal to review, as well as:

- notify the editors if he does not have a sufficient level of competence to evaluate the manuscript;
- notify the editors of any potential conflict of interest or competitive situation in connection with the manuscript;
- refuse to review the manuscript if there is a conflict of interest in connection with it, arising from competition, cooperation or other relationships, or connections with any authors, companies or institutions related to the work, and also if, for any reason, he cannot honestly and impartially evaluate the manuscript;
- respect the confidentiality of the materials provided to him and not discuss unpublished manuscripts with colleagues and not use the information contained in them in his work, keep confidentiality of information about the manuscript and its review;
- avoid personal criticism of the author;
- express their views clearly, supporting them with arguments and, if necessary, references, and should not humiliate or slander the author;

- be objective and constructive when evaluating manuscripts and suggest ways to improve them;
- be specific in your criticisms and provide links to substantiate them;
- give feedback in a timely manner and comply with the rules of the journal;
- in case of intention to transfer the review of the article to your colleague, obtain the preliminary permission of the editor (editor-in-chief, deputy editor-in-chief, editor-in-chief of the issue).

3.8. The terms of reviewing in each individual case are determined by agreement with the editor-in-chief of the issue, but not more than 21 days from the moment the Reviewer agrees to review the manuscript. The term may be extended if additional review is necessary and/or the profile reviewer is temporarily absent.

3.9. The review should unequivocally characterize the theoretical or applied significance of the study, correlate the author's conclusions with existing scientific concepts. A necessary element of the review is the assessment by the reviewer of the personal contribution of the author of the article to the solution of the problem under consideration. It is advisable to note in the review the conformity of the style, logic and accessibility of the presentation to the scientific nature of the material, as well as the reliability and validity of the conclusions (the representativeness of the practical material involved in the analysis, the degree of illustration of the examples given by the author, tables, quantitative data, etc. are assessed). The review ends with a general assessment of the article and a recommendation for publication, revision or reasoned rejection of the material. In case of difficulties with the submission of a detailed review, the Editorial Board recommends that reviewers use a typical review template (Appendix 2). At a minimum, the review should cover all the issues specified in the template. The review cannot contain only unfounded conclusions such as: "the article can be published" or "the article cannot be published". Justifications for making the appropriate decision by the Reviewer should be given.

3.10. Based on the results of the review, the reviewer submits one of the following decisions for consideration by the Editorial Team and the Editorial Board of the journal:

- recommend the article for publication;
- recommend the article for publication after revision/elimination of comments;
- does not recommend the article for publication;
- reject the article.

3.11. If the reviewer recommends the article for publication after revision / elimination of comments, does not recommend the article for publication or recommends rejecting the article, the review should indicate the specific reasons for such a decision with a clear statement of the content and / or technical shortcomings identified in the manuscript, indicating specific pages, if necessary. The comments and wishes of the reviewer should be objective and principled, aimed at raising the scientific and methodological level of the manuscript, and not at criticizing the author.

3.12. Reviewing of materials submitted to the editors of the journal is carried out with confidentiality, and the name of the reviewer is not reported to the author (s), just as the name of the author (s) is not reported to the reviewer.

3.13. The original reviews are kept in the editorial office of the journal for five years. At the request of the Ministry of Education and Science of the Russian Federation, reviews must be submitted to the Higher Attestation Commission and / or the Ministry of Education and Science, and also uploaded to the RSCI database, see clause 4.10.

3.14. For the publication of articles by graduate students and applicants for the degree of candidate of science, the Editorial Board and the Editorial Team of the journal have the right, in

addition to the above reviews, to request the recommendation of the specialized department, which, however, does not exclude the usual review procedure.

4. Decision to publish

4.1. The presence of one positive review is not a sufficient basis for the publication of an article, for more details see clause 3.5 of this Regulation.

4.2. If there are two positive reviews or two positive and one negative reviews, the article is accepted for publication by the decision of the working meeting of the editorial board, headed by the editor-in-chief or deputy editor-in-chief, consisting of members of the editorial board - experts on the subject of the article. After receiving more than 3 ambiguous reviews and / or a controversial situation, the issue of publishing an article is considered at the next meeting of the editorial board and, based on the conclusions of the reviewers, a final decision is made to publish the article or refuse to publish it on the recommendation of a member of the editorial board or executive editor of the journal issue. The decision of the editorial board is taken by a simple majority of votes. In case of equality of votes, the vote of the editor-in-chief is decisive. The quorum for making a decision is set at 50% of the total number of members of the editorial board.

4.3. When making a final decision on accepting an article or refusing to publish it, the editorial board of the journal draws attention to the relevance of the scientific problem being solved by the author and is guided by the feedback received from the Reviewers. When considering the results of peer review, the Editorial Board is obliged to follow the ethical standards of the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE Code of Conduct) <https://publicationethics.org/>. Members of the Editorial Board who took part in the review of works cannot participate in making decisions on the publication of the works of the authors that they reviewed, and their participation in the meeting of the Editorial Board on these issues is not allowed as interested persons in making such decisions.

4.4. On the basis of the decision made, a letter is sent to the author(s) on behalf of the executive secretary to the e-mail address, which gives a general assessment of the article and sets out the decision made regarding the materials submitted by the author(s).

4.5. If the article can be published after revision and elimination of comments, the letter gives recommendations for revision/removal of comments. Reviewers and the editors of the journal do not enter into discussions with the authors of the article about the comments made.

4.6. The article sent by the author(s) to the editorial office after revision / elimination of comments is re-reviewed by the same reviewer or by another one appointed at the discretion of the editorial board. After the article is finalized by the author and the comments are eliminated, the Reviewers give their final consent to the publication of the work, if the article was accepted with comments and a requirement for revision.

4.7. If the article contains a significant share of critical remarks of the reviewer and with a general positive recommendation from other Reviewers, the Editorial Board may classify the material as polemical and publish it in the order of scientific discussion.

4.8. In case of rejection of the article from publication, the Editorial Board sends the author a reasoned refusal within three working days.

4.9. The Editorial Board of the journal sends copies of reviews to the Ministry of Education and Science of the Russian Federation upon receipt of a corresponding request by the Editorial Board of the publication.

4.10. All received reviews are uploaded to the RSCI database in accordance with the concluded agreement, while the name of the reviewer is not disclosed, and the text of the review becomes available to the scientific community on the portal <https://www.elibrary.ru/>.

4.11. An article not recommended by reviewers for publication is not accepted for re-consideration.

LITERATURE

1. Regulations on the publication ethics of the scientific Journal of Oceanological Research. Moscow: IO RAN, 2020. <https://jor.ocean.ru/index.php/jor/navigationMenu/view/cope-code-of-conduct>.
2. International practice on the ethics of editing, reviewing, publishing and authorship of scientific publications / Ed. O.V. Kirillov, V.V. Litvinov, A.A. Yermak // Collection of translations on COPE ethics, prepared by NP NEICON. Moscow: ELSEVIER Publishing House, 2013. 140 p. https://academy.rasep.ru/files/documents/3_1.pdf.
3. Kuleshova A.V., Chekhovich Yu.V., Belenkaya O.S. On the razor's edge: how not to turn self-citation into self-plagiarism // Scientific editor and publisher. 2019. Vol. 4(1–2). pp. 45–51. DOI: 10.24069/2542-0267-2019-1-2-45-51.

Letter of consent to publish an article in a journal "Oceanological Research"

To the Editorial Board
of the scientific Journal of Oceanological Research
117997, Moscow, Nakhimovsky pr. 36

CONSENT TO PUBLICATION OF THE ARTICLE

The authors hereby voluntarily provide the materials of the manuscript and give their consent to the publication of the primary and edited version of the article (title) _____ author(s): _____ (full name) _____ in the scientific Journal of Oceanological Research in English and confirm the affiliations and addresses of organizations and contact details of the authors:

- **V. Ivanov** - V.I. Il'ichev Pacific Oceanological Institute FEB RAS, 43, Baltiyskaya St., Vladivostok, 690041, Russia); e-mail: ivanov@poi.dvo.ru;
- **Other contributors...**

At the moment of accepting the original version of the article for publication in the Journal of Oceanological Research, the authors transfer to the Publishing House of the Institute of Oceanology, Shirshov Institute of Oceanology of the Russian Academy of Sciences, the right to store and distribute the original version, including electronic forms, microfilming and other similar forms of reproduction, together with personal data about authors in electronic and paper versions given in copyright certificates, including the provision of this information to the Scientific Electronic Library (NEB) for inclusion in the database of the Russian Science Citation Index (RSCI), as well as in SCOPUS, Web of Science and other processing systems for wide distribution in other systems for indexing scientific works.

The authors confirm that the presented work:

- has not been previously published (with the exception of publication in the form of a summary, part of a published lecture, review or dissertation);
- not under consideration for publication in other publications;
- approved for publication by all available co-authors;
- approved for publication (in an explicit or implied form) by the institution or responsible institution in which it was performed, and there is also an appropriate examination certificate that the authors attach to the article;
- is genuine and that they have the right to make such a transfer.

The authors agree that the first author acts, accepts responsibility and signs on behalf of all co-authors. Copyright assignment covers the exclusive right to reproduce and distribute an article, including prints, translations, photo reproductions, microforms, electronic forms (on-line and off-line), or any other similar form of reproduction.

Chief Researcher, POI FEB RAS, DSc
Contributors ...

V.Ivanov

Personal data

Place of work/study:

Job title:

Academic degree:

Rank:

Address with postal code for sending the magazine:

Contact tel. (with area code):

Email:

Date

ARTICLE REVIEW

Article title _____

Dear reviewer!

The Review states the subject of research, relevance, research methodology, new results, the presence of mathematical calculations, conclusions and justifications, and comments on the reviewed article. The document is signed by the Reviewer (the signature is deleted when sent to the authors). Submission of comments is mandatory if you believe that the article should be rejected or returned to the authors for revision. Editorial comments can be noted directly in the text of the article. In your review, please answer the following questions:

No	Questions and Criteria for Peer Review	Yes	No	Note
1.	Does the article correspond to the subject of the journal (if not, the rest is not filled in)?			
2.	Does the article comply with the formatting rules?			
3.	Reviewer's comments (if any)?			
4.	Does the article contain new results?			
5.	Does the title match the content?			
6.	Is there a logical and consistent presentation of the material?			
7.	Has an analysis been carried out on the stated problem?			
8.	Is there a statistical processing of the results (experiment)?			
9.	Is the math clear?			
10.	Is the research methodology clearly stated?			
11.	Are the results of the work clearly presented?			
12.	Scientific style of presentation, terminology			
13.	Are the conclusions reasonable enough?			
14.	Does the article have the necessary comparison with the available results?			
15.	Does the article contain the necessary references to sources? (if not, please provide a separate list of sources to cite)			
16.	Are the tables and illustrations of satisfactory quality?			
17.	Is the quality of Abstract/Keywords satisfactory?			
18.	Does the language of the article need editing?			
19.	Can the article be published in its current form (possibly with some editorial corrections)?			
20.	Should the article be returned to the authors for revision? (if yes, please attach specific comments)			
21.	Should the article be rejected? (if yes, please attach specific comments)			
22.	Should the article be submitted to another publication? If so, which one?			
23.	Should the article be sent to another reviewer? If yes, can you recommend a reviewer?			
24.	Reviewer's comments (if any)			

Recommendation for publication (underline):

Accept for publication	Publish after revision/elimination of comments	Reject
------------------------	--	--------

Reviewer: signature _____ (full name _____)

Academic degree: _____

Job title: _____

Place of work: _____

Date: _____