

Regulations

for the peer reviewing of the papers, submitted to the Weapons History Journal

1. General positions

1.1 All the papers, sent to the WHJ editorial board, undergo the peer reviewing.

1.2 Goal and tasks:

- The peer reviewing is aimed to provide and ensure the publication of valid and trustworthy information, aiding the development of weapons history knowledge both in Russia and abroad.
- The task of peer reviewing is the unbiased evaluation of scientific and practical significance of papers submitted.

1.3 The evaluation peer reviewing is anonymous that is a reviewer does not know writer's name and vice versa.

2. Procedure for organizing and conducting of peer reviewing

2.1 Each paper, submitted to WHJ editorial board, is received by the editor-in-chief, tested against the requirements on preparation, and registered.

2.2 All the submitted papers are analyzed by the members of the editorial board as well.

2.3 In case of positive decision by most of the editorial board members, writer is informed about the acceptance of the paper for evaluation peer reviewing.

2.4 The editor-in-chief chooses the proper reader, sends him or her the paper within a week, and receives the assent or reject to peer review from the reviewer. In the last case, the deputy editor-in-chief chooses another reader.

2.5 Review (about 0,5 or 1 page text) is prepared within four weeks, beginning the day reader accepted to write it. In certain circumstances in order to publish the submitted and accepted paper quickly the editorial board can ask a reader to hasten.

2.6 Reader is informed a submitted paper to be an intellectual property of its writer and must be kept under wraps. Readers are not allowed to make copies of the paper submitted for meeting own needs.

2.7 Review is prepared according to the model (see appendix).

2.8 In case of a negative evaluation, the paper is sent for extra peer reviewing to another reader, chosen by an editor-in-chief.

2.9 Reviews with both positive and negative evaluation are delivered to writers in order to inform them about necessary changings and corrections, if any, to be made in the paper, or about the denial of publishing for reasons explained.

3. Procedure for correcting papers according to reader's comments

3.1 If review contains comments on necessary corrections of paper peer reviewed, both texts, the paper and the review (staying anonymous for writer), are delivered to writer via e-mail or post.

- 3.2 Paper sent to writer for correcting, must be corrected and sent back within two weeks. The corrected variant must be accompanied by writer's letter, containing responses for all the critical comments made by reader, and explanations concerning all the changes occurred.
- 3.3 In case of reader's critical comments being not important for the story, the paper is sent to writer to be corrected in accordance with them all the same, though secondary peer reviewing is not carried out. If the comments are important, the paper is delivered for correcting, but secondary peer reading by the same reader takes place.
- 3.4 The date, the corrected paper is sent back to the editorial board, is considered as the date the paper is received.

4. Procedure for deciding on paper acceptance or denial to the publishing

- 4.1 The editorial board makes decision on whether paper is accepted or denied to the publishing on the grounds of peer reviewing results.
- 4.2 The decision on paper acceptance to the publishing is made on the grounds of its positive evaluation by reader(-s).
- 4.3 In case of negative evaluation, the paper is sent to another reader. If the second evaluation is also negative, the paper is denied. If the second evaluation is positive, the editorial board makes decision on accepting the paper to the publishing. The paper could be sent to the third reader, if the editorial board considers it reasonable.
- 4.4 After the decision on acceptance/denial of paper to the publishing is made, the editor-in-chief informs writer and announces the target time of publication.

5. Documents issues

- 5.1 In case of lack of critical comments from reader, the text of review is not delivered to writer.
- 5.2 The original texts of reviews are kept in the editorial office during three years since article was published.

Suggested model for review

1. Reader's full name
2. Title of paper
3. Evaluation of paper correspondence to the remit of the journal
4. Topicality of the research
5. For a newly published article:
 - evaluation of its originality and practical importance;
 - evaluation of its methodological approach.
6. Tone of voice: for how logically the topic and research are presented, and whether the text is comprehensible for the target audience in terms of language use, narrative style, and the layout of the text, ostensiveness of tables, schemes, drawings and formulae, if any.
7. Comments on paper weaknesses, if any, corrections and updates to be made by author; recommendations for the text improvement.
8. Additional comments, things to note and suggest.
9. Conclusion:
 - paper is recommended to the publishing;
 - paper needs improvement;
 - paper is not recommended to the publishing.
10. Reader's signature.