



## **PEER REVIEW PROCEDURE**

### **for papers submitted for publication in the Proceedings of Krylov State Research Centre**

#### **1. General**

- 1.1 “Proceedings of the Krylov State Research Centre” is listed among nation-wide research & engineering periodicals recommended by the Russian State Commission for Academic Degrees and Titles (VAK) for publication of papers authored by degree-seeking applicants.
- 1.2 The Proceedings have been registered as a mass medium with an international standard serial number (ISSN 0869-8422). It is published in Russian.
- 1.3 The Proceedings is intended for publishing papers based on research and development efforts in the following fields:
  - general ship science issues (information, analytical, research, economic features);
  - ship theory;
  - design;
  - structural mechanics;
  - strength and structural design;
  - ship maneuverability;
  - hydro- and aerodynamics;
  - ship power plants and machinery;
  - nuclear and radiation safety;
  - ship electric equipment;
  - ship physical fields;
  - shipbuilding production processes;
  - technical regulations;
  - standardization and certification in shipbuilding.
- 1.4 The content of Proceedings features matches the research & engineering specialties of KSRC staff by research units: 05.08.01 – Ship Theory and Structural Mechanics; 05.08.03 – Ship Design and Hull Structures; 05.08.05 – Ship Power Plants and Machinery (main and auxiliary); 05.08.06 – Physical Fields of Ship, Ocean and Atmosphere including Interaction Processes.
- 1.5 All papers submitted for publication are subject to peer review and, in some cases, academic editing. Review and editing is done by highly qualified experts.

#### **2. Review purposes and goals**

- 2.1 Reviewing is intended to ensure a high level of publications abreast with modern requirements which the leading research & engineering periodicals have to meet. .
- 2.2 Purposes:
  - Impartial judgment of paper content;
  - Rejection of papers whose content is of no scientific value or beside the point.

#### **3. Review qualification**

- 3.1 Peer reviews of manuscripts shall provide well-grounded answers to the following questions:

- if the paper content matches the subject stated;
- if the paper contains scientifically novel (original) subject matter, if yes, it should be identified;
- if the paper contains any novel (original) information, if yes, it should be identified;
- how the reviewed paper is related to the existing literature and recent research in the relevant fields;
  - if there are any signs of wrongful appropriation or any other form of scientific misconduct by the author in his paper;
  - if the paper is of practical relevance, if yes, it should be identified;
  - if the subject matter is presented clearly: the paper meets the general and special requirements regarding text structure, language and writing style, terminology used, clear tables, diagrams, figures and formulae layout, accuracy of footnote arrangement, reference list accuracy, etc.;
  - if a reference list is included and correctly presented.

3.2. The review is to be concluded by a general judgment whether the paper is qualified for publication.

#### **4. Reviewer selection**

4.1. The Editor-in-Chief, the deputy chief editor or any member of the editorial board appointed by them nominates a reviewer from among prominent scientists or highly qualified experts working in:

- Krylov State Research Center;
- relevant research institutions;
- relevant academic institutions in St. Petersburg and other regions.

4.2. The reviewer is appointed based on voluntary participation and independence principles.

4.3. Reviewing is free of charge.

#### **5. Arrangements and time limits**

5.1. Submitted papers are reviewed on the anonymous basis.

5.2. Paper authors and reviewers communicate via competent members of the editorial board who:

- formalize the article reviewing procedure;
- provide the Editor-in-Chief and the deputy chief editor with the information about the conclusion and result of the reviewing process;
- conduct correspondence with the authors and the reviewers in their own name on issues related to the reviewing process;
- settle disputes and conflicts between authors and their reviewers;
- notify in writing the authors of the review conclusion and decision of the editorial board pertaining to the paper publishing.

5.3. The review is to be prepared within a month after submittal to the reviewer. Should this time limit be exceeded, the reviewer would return the paper and the review is assigned to another reviewer.

5.4. The review is done in writing on a white paper in A4 format, it is signed by the reviewer, and one copy is sent by mail, e-mail or by fax to the editorial department addressed to a qualified member of the editorial board.

5.5. If two or more papers of one author are being reviewed simultaneously, the review is prepared for each paper separately.

5.6. The authors receive the review in writing on anonymity basis. If the authors disagree with the reviewers' comments, they could submit well-grounded objections to the editorial board.

5.7. Any dispute or conflict between the author and reviewer is settled by the Editor-in-Chief or the deputy chief editor in due course. In certain most difficult cases a dispute or a conflict between authors and reviewers can be discussed at the editorial board meeting.

Director General  
Krylov State Research Center

Vladimir S. Nikitin