
PROCEDURE OF SUBMISSION, REVIEW AND PUBLICATION

1 General Provisions

1.1 This document determines the order and procedure for submitting, reviewing and publishing copyright manuscripts received by the journal “Computer Tools in Education.”

1.2 The author is responsible for promptly responding to letters by the editorial team and to observe the agreed terms for making corrections and submitting additional documents.

1.3 If the author, for one reason or another, is unable to fulfill the obligations, he should:

- immediately (without waiting for the expiration of the term) inform the editorial team about it;
- report the reasons for the delay;
- propose a new term.

1.4 The editorial team reserves the right to reject the manuscript at any stage of consideration and preparation of the publication:

- if the authors violate the accepted obligations regarding terms without valid reasons;
- the corresponding author does not respond to letters of the editorial team for more than 2 weeks.

This provision regulates only the normal course of the editorial process. In case of ethical violations by any participant, the procedures described in the Regulations on Publishing Ethics for the journal CTE should be followed.

2 Procedure for the initial consideration of the article

2.1 Initially, only the text of the manuscript should be sent to the journal. The material should be sent through the article submission form.

2.2 The article is accepted for consideration by the responsible editor of the journal provided that it meets the basic requirements for articles published in the journal CTE (scientific direction, volume, quality).

2.3 The materials in the article should not be classified. The presence of a restrictive classification constitutes a basis for rejecting the publication of the material.

2.4 The manuscript of the scientific article submitted to the journal is examined for compliance with the requirements of the journal and the presence of borrowings. To identify borrowings, the editors use specialized software. The final decision on accepting the manuscript for review is taken by the responsible editor (no later than 7 working days after the receipt of the manuscript).

2.5 A reason for rejecting the manuscript may also be the identification of a potential conflict of interest or the inability by the editorial staff to organize a qualitative review for the given scientific research.

2.6 Article admitted by the responsible editor is sent for peer review. The author is notified accordingly.

2.7 In case of rejection of the manuscript prior to the reviewing stage, a letter is sent to the author indicating the reason for the rejection.

3 Order and procedure for reviewing manuscripts

3.1 All articles submitted to the editorial office of the journal are subject to mandatory peer review (evaluation by experts).

3.2 In the review process are involved scientists with a recognized authority who work in the area of knowledge, to which the contents of the manuscript belong.

3.3 Reviewers are required to follow the adopted Regulations on the Ethics of Scientific Publications.

3.4 One-way "blind" reviewing (the author does not know the reviewers) is mandatory for all articles. The reviewer evaluates the article for the relevance of the topic and scientific novelty, as well as its structure and style of presentation. All remarks and recommendations for the article are made in the review. If comments made by reviewers are to be eliminated, then the article is sent to the author for revision. The editorial team of the journal reserves the right to refuse publication of an article whose author refuses to consider comments made by the reviewers. The reviewer also has the right to conduct, in any way deemed necessary, additional verification of the use of borrowings in the text of the publication.

3.5 The reviewer should evaluate the article sent to him in the set deadlines and provide to the responsible editor a written review. The review is created by means of the electronic editor by filling out the template available there (in the personal account of the reviewer). In this case, the reviewer should follow the recommendations specified in the document "Regulations on reviewing". In each individual case, the deadline for the review is determined by the editor individually and is communicated to the corresponding author of the article.

3.7 Based on the results of the review, the reviewer submits to the editors of the journal one of the following solutions for consideration:

- the manuscript is recommended for publication without changes;
- the manuscript is recommended for publication, it is necessary to make changes;
- the manuscript requires a substantial revision (second review);
- it is recommended to reject the manuscript.

3.8 If the reviewer recommends an article for publication after revision / compliance with comments or does not recommend an article for publication, 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, specifying the specific pages, if necessary. The comments and recommendations of the reviewer should be objective and principled, aimed at increasing the scientific and methodological level of the manuscript.

3.9 If the review contains recommendations for correcting and revising the article, the text of the review is sent to the author with the request to either take them into account when preparing a new version of the article, or to refute them by successfully arguing (partially or completely) against them. The revised (or modified) article by the author is sent again for review. In this case, the date of receipt by the journal is the date the revised article was returned.

3.10 Violation of the reviewer's confidentiality is possible only if the reviewer claims that the materials stated in the article are unreliable or falsified.

3.11 An article not recommended by the reviewer for publication is not accepted for reconsideration.

3.12 The originals the reviews are stored by the editorial office for 5 years. At the request of the Ministry of Education and Science of the Russian Federation, the reviews are compulsorily submitted to the Higher Attestation Commission and / or the Ministry of Education and Science.

4 Decision on publication

4.1 If at least one of the reviews is positive and the author corrects all comments (if indicated in the review), the editor-in-chief makes the final decision on publishing the manuscript or refusing to publish it. The editor's decision is communicated to the corresponding author.

4.2 Before the publication, the manuscript undergoes literary editing. Literary editing is carried out by the editorial staff.

4.3 For literary editing are accepted manuscripts designed in accordance with the requirements for the manuscripts of the journal *Computer Tools in Education*. The author must bring the manuscript to the proper form as soon as possible, after receiving a positive response about the publication.

4.4 In the process of literary editing, on the initiative of the editors and / or the author, corrections can be made to the manuscript necessary to correct grammatical, syntactic and stylistic errors, as well as to increase the clarity or readability of the material. If the author himself makes changes and sends a new version of the manuscript to the responsible editor, he should attach comments with a list of the corrections made.

4.5 The final version of the manuscript is sent to the author for approval.

4.6 The deadline for the publication of the approved article depends on the publication schedule of the journal and the number of articles awaiting publication.