

Reviewing procedure for the manuscripts submitted to the Journal «Transplantologiya. The Russian Journal of Transplantation»

All submitted manuscripts considered for publication in the Journal are subject to the double "blind" peer-review process (that is voluntary, independent and unbiased, the confidentiality of the material being kept). Reviewers (or referees) are typically selected from among the Editorial Board members. In addition to these members, outside referees who are experts in the field may also be involved, if necessary.

The materials which are subject to reviewing are forwarded to the selected reviewers by the Executive Secretary of the Journal within 10 working days from the date of manuscript receipt at the Editorial Office.

The reviewers is expected to read it closely and provide his/her individual critiques, comments and opinion on a special Editorial Form within 7 working days.

The reviewer evaluates the manuscript on a five-point scale for the following: the scientific relevance of the topic, the clarity in defining the aims and objectives of the study, the appropriateness of the design and statistic methodology chosen, the validity of statistical analysis, the completeness of presented patients' baseline data, a proper match of a control group, the importance of the findings, the credibility of study results, the quality and informative value of illustrative material (figures, graphs, etc.), the style of presentation, the validity of conclusions, and other characteristics. The reviewer is also expected to give the opinion as to whether the paper should be published, improved or rejected.

If the paper is considered acceptable for publication but needs some revision, the reviewers notes its weaknesses or problems along with suggestions for the improvement.

If the reviewer considers the paper inappropriate for publication, this opinion should be reasonably explained.

In situations where the Editorial Board disagrees substantially with the reviewer's opinion about the quality of the manuscript, the paper will be forwarded to another referee/reviewer, expert.

A hard copy of the reviewer's evaluation shall be signed by the reviewer and submitted to the Editorial Office for the Executive Secretary. Additionally, a soft copy may be forwarded to the Editorial Office by e-mail.

The reviewer's comments and critical remarks, if any, shall be sent to the author for the manuscript revision and making necessary improvement. Corrections shall be agreed upon with a reviewer. In case the author fails to do so within 3 months since receiving a copy of the initial review, the editorial board takes the manuscript off the register and notifies the author accordingly. The revised version shall be approved by the reviewer.

If author and reviewers meet insoluble contradictions regarding revision of the manuscript, the editor-in-chief resolves the conflict by his own authority.

The editorial board reaches final decision to reject a manuscript on the hearing according to reviewers' recommendations, and duly notifies the authors of their decision via e-mail. The board does not accept previously rejected manuscripts for re-evaluation.

Upon the decision to accept the manuscript for publishing, the editorial staff notifies the authors of the scheduled date of publication.

Kindly note that positive review does not guarantee the acceptance, as final decision in all cases lies with the editorial board. By his authority, editor-in-chief rules final solution of every conflict.

Original reviews of submitted manuscripts remain deposited for 5 years.