

THE PROCEDURE OF MANUSCRIPT REVIEWING IN THE JOURNAL “COMBUSTION AND EXPLOSION”

1. Manuscripts submitted to the journal are previously considered by the Editor-in-Chief, the Deputy Editor-in-Chief or the Executive Secretary of the journal.
2. The Editor-in-Chief (the Deputy Editor-in-Chief or the Executive Secretary of the journal) appoints two reviewers for an article from among the members of the Editorial Board or from the leading experts in this field of science. The terms of article reviewing should not exceed two weeks.
3. The format of the review is attached to this document.
4. The comments received from the reviewers should be submitted to the Editorial Board for further sending to the authors (the reviewers' names should not be known by the authors).
5. The Editorial Board sends the copies of the reviewers' comments to the Ministry of Education and Science of Russian Federation upon requirement.
6. If the review is positive and does not require article revision, the article is submitted to the Editorial Board for considering its publication in the journal.
7. In case of necessity to revise the article, an author (authors) should be notified about it, and after receiving a revised version of the text, the article is sent to the same reviewer (reviewers) for a repeated review. If the reviewer is satisfied with the revised version of the article, he or she would notify the Executive Secretary of the journal about it without submitting the repeated comments. In this case, the revised article is submitted to the Editorial Board for considering its publication in the journal.
8. All reviews are kept in the archive of the Editorial Board for 5 years.

Sergey M. Frolov
Editor-in-Chief
Combustion and Explosion Journal
12.01.2015

**APPENDIX: THE FORMAT OF THE REVIEWERS
COMMENTS**

**The Journal "Combustion and
Explosion" Review of the article**

Authors:

Title:

(submitted in _____[year]).

Reviewer: (name of the reviewer with the indication of the academic degrees and title)

Estimates by indicators
(tick the right position)

	Very low or absent	Low	Satisfactory	Good	High
Adequacy of the literature review in terms of the current state of research					
The correspondence to the journal scope					
Scientific value					
The reliability of the results					
Significance for applications					
The overall quality					

Recommendations

(underline the right position)

- Accept without revision
- Accept with minor revision
- Requires major revision and repeated reviewing
- Reject

Comments

(reviewer's comments and recommendations)

Reviewer (name)