

Rules for article reviewing

[at the journal *Music: Art, Research, Practice.*]

1. All materials submitted to the editorial office are subject to a preliminary assessment by the editor-in-chief for their compliance with the formal requirements, posted on the journal website [http://www.kazanconservatoire.ru/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=1108&Itemid=389], as well as with anti-plagiarism rules.
2. Materials, not rejected as a result of the preliminary checking, are subject to mandatory reviewing.
3. Reviewing of articles is carried out for maintaining high scientific and theoretical level of the periodical, as well as for selecting the most valuable and relevant materials for publication.
4. Submitted materials should include:
 - * one copy of the article, read through and signed by the author (co-authors),
 - * information about the author (s) (author's profile)
 - * letter to the editor,
 - * article summary in English language,
 - * key words in English language,
 - * CV (resume) in English language.
 - * Electronic version of all documents on electronic media or by e-mail sent to [kazmusicasp@gmail.com].
5. Article is registered by the executive secretary in the office article log indicating the date, title, author's name and place(s) of work. The article is given a unique registration number, when entered into the database.
6. The editor-in-chief sends the article for reviewing to a member /members of the editorial board, supervising the corresponding division. If necessary, the editor in chief sends the article to review the external reviewers.
7. Each article must have a review by a professional of corresponding scientific profile, having a doctorate degree or PhD.
8. The article should not be classified. The presence of the mark *classified* is a basis for rejecting the material from publication.
9. The reviews are carried out by experts – the members of the editorial board or other reputable researchers working in cooperation with the journal editors, but cannot be done by academic advisors for their disciples.
10. All research materials, submitted by the authors, are subject to reviewing, including the authors who do not have an academic degree.

11. The reviewer presents an expert opinion within one month upon the receipt of the manuscript.

12. The review (expert opinion) should briefly assess the following:

- the overall scientific level of the article;
 - title of the article and its conformity with the contents;
 - relevance of the topic;
 - scientific novelty, theoretical and practical significance of the findings presented;
 - structure of the article;
 - presence of questionable and /or incorrect statements;
- * Compliance with the readers' interests.

In addition, the review should contain the reviewer's opinion about the possibility or impossibility of the manuscript's publication:

- in the author's version;
- after revision of the manuscript (according to a list of items for correction);
- after revision of the manuscript and additional reviewing (with an indication of the major recommendations for revision).

13. The content of the review shall be disclosed to the author(s) within two weeks upon receipt of the expert opinion by the editorial staff.

14. If necessary, an additional review of the manuscripts can be carried out by another expert. The grounds for the additional reviewing are:

- the primary expert's insufficient qualification in the matters discussed in the manuscript;
- extremely disputable provisions made in the manuscript.

15. Article submitted by the author to the editorial board after accommodating of the reviewer's comments, is review in the general order. A note in the office article log is made of the receipt date of the article's new version.

16. The reviewing of materials submitted to the journal shall be strictly confidential. The reviewer's name is not disclosed to the author. Information about the author is not given to the reviewer.