



How to review manuscripts

The review should contain substantiated **remarks for authors** and **confidential recommendations for the Editor-in-Chief**. Be specific and avoid vague judgments. Please deliver the review on time.

Attention should be paid to the originality of the work and clarity of its presentation.

- **Originality.** The manuscript should contain new results and ideas or a novel analysis of literature data not published previously. The work should be free from intrinsic contradictions, and the investigations methods used have to be adequate. If the work or its significant part has been published earlier or is the copy of a paper of other authors, report this to the Editorial Board, together with corresponding references.
- **Clarity.** The manuscript should be readable, intelligible, and complete, but not verbose.

Please indicate to what extent the manuscript meets the following requirements for a paper.

- **The title** of the paper should reflect the subject of investigation in a precise compact form. Word combinations "To the question ...," "On the problem ...," etc. should be avoided. In its optimum variant, the title includes the main keywords used in the text.
- **Abstract** is a concise summary of the paper with basic results of investigation and ways of their achievement, with emphasis on the novelty and practical importance of the results obtained. Descriptions of data published earlier, commonly known propositions and formulas, and references are not cited. The Abstract should not exceed 250 words.
- **Introduction** has to attract interest of broad reading public to the scientific problem touched upon in the work. The results published earlier should be mentioned, and the main aim of the investigation has to be formulated.
- **Investigation methods.** The plan of the investigation has to correspond to the task set. Authors have to explain how results were obtained, detail the equipment used and materials examined, and include the corresponding references to the investigation methods published earlier.
- **Results and discussion.** Authors have to clearly and logically expound and analyze the results obtained. The data presented have to be statistically reliable. Authors have to show how the results are connected with the hypotheses proposed and earlier investigations. If necessary, indicate how to improve the presentation of data and also suggest additional experiments and analysis of results.
- **Conclusion** must not duplicate the abstract. In this section, the importance of the results obtained for the development of the field of science and prospects for investigations into the problem touched upon can be substantiated. Authors have to clearly formulate inferences about their work and to show if its aim has been achieved and the problems posed have been solved.
- **Tables and figures.** The text have to include references to all tables and figures. Experimental data and calculation results not discussed in the text of article should not be presented. The use of tables and graphs for presenting the same results has to be avoided. The tables and graphs should not contain unexplained abbreviations. Next to the designations of quantities, their dimensions have to be indicated. The lines and marks on figures have to be clearly distinguishable and the captions and legends of figures readable.
- **References.** All references have to be mentioned in the text. Pay attention to the accuracy, number, and appropriateness of citing. The self-citing of authors' works has to be moderate.

Throughout the paper, a unified principle of designations has to be observed, with their first explanations given in parentheses or in the text. Mixed Russian and Latin indices should be avoided. Please point to the necessary changes in the style and grammar and to other shortcomings.