

PROVISION
on peer-review procedure of articles submitted to the Editorial board of
the scientific and practical journal "Medical Law"

I. General provisions

1. This provision regulates the internal and external peer-review procedure of articles submitted to the editorial board of the scientific and practical journal "Medical Law" (hereinafter – the journal).

2. In this provision the following terms shall have the following meanings:

Author is a person or group of persons (group of authors), who produced a scientific article as a result of conducted research and submitted it to the editorial board.

Executive secretary is a person, who organizes planning of timely and qualitative preparation of articles for the journal.

Chairman of the scientific council is a person who provides the quality of scientific articles, which are published in the journal and contributes to the impact factor of the journal.

Editor in chief is a person who chairs the scientific board of the journal and makes final decisions regarding the issue of the journal.

Editorial board is a management body of the journal, which provides a set of measures in order to form the journal materials and print the journal. The editorial board consists of the scientific council and editorial council. Information about the editorial board members can be found on the journal website: <http://medicallaw.org.ua/zhurnal-medychne-pravo/editorial-staff/>.

A reviewer is an expert who acts on behalf of the journal and provides scientific expertise of the materials, including articles, submitted to the journal, in order to determine suitability of these materials for publication in the journal. A Doctor of Science or Doctor of Philosophy in a relevant field, who has scientific papers on the topic covered by paper, can be a reviewer.

Peer-review is a procedure for examination and experts' evaluation by reviewers of articles submitted to the journal in order to estimate the scientific and theoretical levels of articles and compliance with the journal requirements.

Internal peer-review - procedure for examination and experts' evaluation of article by a reviewer selected from list of editorial board of the journal members.

External peer-review - procedure for examination and experts' evaluation of article by a reviewer, appointed from the group of persons, who have a scientific degree of Doctor of Science or Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) in the relevant field and has published works on the topic, which was declared in article and is not a member of the editorial board of the journal. External peer-review is made by the reviewer based on the agreement, which was concluded with the reviewer.

Working group is a group of persons from among the members of the editorial council and scientific council of the journal, consisting of not less than four persons (two persons from the editorial council and scientific council, respectively), and chief editor of the journal, who make a decision on the

recommendation for publication of article. Members of the working group are appointed by the editor in chief before next issue of the journal is launched.

3. All scientific articles submitted to the editorial board are subject to internal and external peer-review.

4. Articles submitted by members of the editorial board of the journal, researchers with significant scientific contributions in the relevant field and articles prepared by order of the journal may not pass standard procedure of review. In such circumstances the decision whether to accept the paper for publication is passed by a majority vote of the working group (the editor in chief has the casting vote).

5. The editor in chief selects reviewers, who conduct a peer-review of article, based on the topics covered in the article and professional interests of experts. Experts are selected from the members of the editorial board. If necessary, the editor in chief may engage as an expert any person, who is not a member of the editorial board.

6. When carrying out the peer-review experts must comply with ethics requirements provided by the Committee on Publication Ethics (<http://publicationethics.org/>) and be maximally objective and impartial.

II. Peer-review procedure of articles

1. The author submits an article to the editorial board of the journal, following requirements¹ to be met by journal articles (further – requirements). Article that does not meet these requirements is not registered and permitted to further review. Such decision is notified to the author.

2. Before the peer-review the executive secretary of the journal:

2.1. Determines the degree of uniqueness of the author's text using appropriate software (eTXT Антиплагиат). The article is not permitted to further review and is returned to the author if the percentage of its originality is less than 60%.

2.2. Provides article coding (assigning registration number and depersonalization of personal data of the author).

3. The coded article is sent by e-mail to reviewers appointed by the editor in chief.

4. Within 5 calendar days from the date article was accepted, the reviewer evaluates the possibility of article peer-review on the basis of his own qualifications, topic covered in the paper and lack of conflict of interest². Such decision is notified to the editor in chief. In case of the conflict of interest or inability to conduct the peer-review, the editor in chief takes a decision on the

1 Information about the requirements to be met by journal articles can be found under the heading "For authors" on the journal website: <http://medicallaw.org.ua/vidavnictvo/medychne-pravo/avtoram/>.

2 A conflict of interest is a situation in which a reviewer is involved in multiple interests, financial interest, or otherwise, one of which could possibly affect the objectivity and impartiality of reviewer who takes a decision on the peer-review results.

appointment of another reviewer. The refusal to conduct a peer-review of article should be motivated by reviewer.

5. Within 20 calendar days from the date article was accepted, the reviewer gives a conclusion on suitability of the article for publication in the journal. If necessary the review period may be extended to calendar 25 days. Such decision is notified by the reviewer to the editor in chief.

6. External and internal reviewer and authors remain unfamiliar to each other throughout the review process. The review procedure is conducted by two reviewers (one internal and one external reviewer) (double-blind peer review). The interaction between author and reviewers occurs via email correspondence through the executive secretary of the journal.

7. The reviewer each separately fill out a standardized form on the results of the peer-review (hereinafter – Journal Article Assessment Form) (Annex 1 of the Provision), which reflects one of the following conclusions:

- to recommend article for publication;
- to send article to author for revision;
- do not recommend article for publication.

The form for review is sent to the executive secretary of the journal.

8. The decision of the reviewer is notified to the author of article via sending an e-mail by the executive secretary.

9. If the reviewer takes a decision on revising article, the executive secretary, in consultation with the editor in chief, sends this article to the author for revision. Remarks, questions, comments of the reviewer are attached to the letter. The term of revision is determined by the editor in chief and must not exceed 5 calendar days after receiving the article by the author.

10. The author adds to the revised article a letter with answers to comments and questions of the reviewer and explanation of all the changes made to article.

11. Updated version of article is again submitted to the reviewer for his conclusion. Within 5 days from the date the updated article is submitted, the reviewer gives one of the following conclusions:

- to recommend article for publication;
- do not recommend the article for publication.

12. In case article receives one positive and one negative conclusion, the final decision on article's publishing in the journal is adopted by the working group.

13. If the author does not agree with the opinion of the reviewer, he has the right to give a reasoned response to the editorial board. In such circumstances, article is considered at the meeting of the working group that examines in detail the opinion of the reviewer and author of article. The working group may send the journal article for additional review to another reviewer. The working group reserves the right to reject the article in case of inability or unwillingness to take into account the comments of the reviewer(s) by the author. Any of the decisions made by the working group is notified to the author separately.

14. The final decision on the suitability of article for publication in the journal is taken by the editor in chief and if necessary by the working group of the journal. The decision is notified to the author of article by the executive secretary.

15. Article accepted for publication is given to the literary editor. Minor corrections of stylistic nature that do not affect the content of the article can be made by the technical editor without the consent of the author. At the request of author the layout of article is sent to the author for approval. If there are many linguistic and stylistic corrections, which can influence the content of article, the text of article is agreed by the author. At the request of author, he or she can make a correction to the article by himself, but he or she must return the corrected version no later than 5 days after article was sent to him by the literary editor via e-mail. Corrections should be agreed within 2 calendar days from the date article was submitted by the literary editor via email.

16. A new issue with articles that have been processed by reviewers and technical editor is formed, signed by the editor in chief and recommended for publication by decision of the scientific council of one of the founders of the journal.

17. Liability for copyright infringement is imposed on the author. The author is responsible for the verification of facts and data, conclusion validity and scientific and theoretical level of article.

Journal Article Assessment Form

Name and surname of reviewer	
Article title	
Article number	
The date article was received by the reviewer	
The date the peer-review was finished	
Signature of the reviewer	
QUESTION	YES / NO
Does the subject of article meet the scientific profile of the journal?	
Is the subject of article actual?	
Does the title of article reflect the contents set out in it?	
Are the goal and objective of article clearly identified?	
Are the purpose of article achieved and its objectives fulfilled?	
Are the research results shown methodologically correct?	
Are the results of scientific research substantiated?	
Are the findings of the research complete and reasonable?	
Does the article contain enough references to scientific sources, legislation, international and regional standards?	
Are the findings of previous research on this issue reflected in article and are they fully taken into account?	

Does article contain the author's own thoughts about the views of scientists, who have studied the same issue?	
Do the results of research contain scientific novelty?	
Does article contain recommendations for further research of these issues?	
Peer-review conclusion (mark with the sign "+")	<input type="checkbox"/> to recommend article for publication <input type="checkbox"/> to send article to author for revision <input type="checkbox"/> do not recommend article for publication

Reviewer's comments to article*

Note*: remarks, comments, questions, recommendations
for the author of article