

Appendix N 3

Ratified on the session (Document N 6) of the

Scientific Council of

Public Administration Academy of RA

on May 31, 2019

ORDER

**OF INNITIAL CHECK AND REVIEW OF
THE MANUSCRIPTS SUBMITTED TO
THE “PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION” JOURNAL OF
PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION ACADEMY OF RA**

1. GENERAL TERMS

1. The order defines the proceeding of initial check and review of the manuscripts submitted to the “Public Administration” journal (Journal) of Public Administration Academy of the Republic of Armenia.
2. The purpose of the initial check and review of the manuscripts is to assure quality of the Journal.

2. INNITIAL CHECK OF THE MANUSCRIPTS

3. The initial check of the manuscripts submitted to the Journal is initiated by the Editorial Council.
4. In the result of the initial check, the conformity of the work provided by the author for printing with the standards and requirements defined by the “Order of design and presentation of the manuscripts presented to the “Public Administration” journal of Public Administration Academy of RA” is assessed.
5. If the design and presentation standards and requirements are not provided, they refuse it publication. And the author is informed about it. The author can present the work again after having provided conformity with the required standards and requirements.
6. The work that have initially been checked for being printed in the Journal must be reviewed. The work presented to the Journal are printed only if it has been positively reviewed.

3. REVIEW ORGANIZATION

7. The review of the manuscripts is provided by the qualified specialists (reviewers), information about them is not reported.
8. All provided work (manuscripts) undergo “de-personalization”, i.e. information about the author is wholly removed before it is sent for reviewing.
9. The review term shall not exceed 30 days from the moment it is submitted to the reviewer.
10. The reviewer is prohibited to copy the manuscript for his/her own purposes, or to hand the manuscript (or any part of it) to anyone.

4. REQUIREMENTS TO THE REVIEW CONTENT

11. The review shall include the quality analyses of the manuscript and the objectively reasoned assessment.
12. Professional (expert) assessment of the manuscript quality shall be presented in the review, particularly:
 - 1) Conformity of the content with the title of the manuscript,
 - 2) Analyses and assessment of the academic level of the research, importance and urgency of the theme and innovation, and economic and applied importance,
 - 3) Relevance of the methods, results and conclusions used in the research to the modern scientific achievements,
 - 4) Logic and succession of the work,
 - 5) Degree of accuracy of the written facts and completeness of revelation of the theme,
 - 6) Expediency and argumentation of existence of tables, charts and other deductive material in the manuscript,
 - 7) Assertion and argumentation of the written reasons and conclusions,
 - 8) Assessment of personal contribution of the author of the manuscript in resolution of the researched problem,
 - 9) Relevance of the manuscript language and style with the requirements of scientific publications,
 - 10) Inaccuracies, omissions and mistakes in the manuscript, absence of references to information sources,
 - 11) To assess the completeness, quality of the sources in the list of literature, and their relevance with the subject of the article,
 - 12) To assess the list of sources, not to allow unknown and insignificant sources,
 - 13) To demand to make corrections, additions (i.e. to demand to replace the references of the dissertation or the abstract with references of dissertation related articles and manuscripts where the research outcomes of the author have been published), etc.,
 - 14) To demand accurate references,
13. Review shall embrace one of the bellow mentioned proposals:
 - 1) To guarantee publication of the manuscript,
 - 2) To allow publication of the manuscript only if it has been worked out (to make changes and complements) by the author,
 - 3) and to refuse to publish the submitted manuscript.
14. After the reviewer studied the manuscript, he/she will work out a written opinion and submit it to the editorial board defined by the "Charter of publishing the 'Public Administration' scientific journal of Public Administration Academy of RA".

5. PRESENTATION OF REVIEWS TO THE AUTHORS

15. The editorial board sends the review (its main content) to the author only after previously "de-personalizing" the review, i.e. information about the reviewer is wholly removed.
16. If the manuscript is positively assessed, the editorial informs the author whether the manuscript has been accepted for publication, and the approximate terms for its publication.
17. In the result of the review, if a need to work out (to make changes and complements) the manuscript by the author arises, the manuscript is returned to the author. The clear terms

within which the author has to work out the material to be published and/or answer the remarks of the reviewer shall be mentioned. The author, after working out and/or answering the remarks of the reviewer, again submits the manuscript to the editorial.

18. To attain professional opinion, the worked-out manuscript is again sent to be reviewed. In the result of which the worked-out manuscript is offered:
 - 1) To be guaranteed for publishing,
 - 2) To be worked out again,
 - 3) To be rejected.
19. If the manuscript has generally been assessed positively by the reviewer but still there are some disagreements in approaches, reasonings and other issues, it can be published under “Scientific debate” title.
20. If the manuscript has been assessed negatively, the editorial is authorized to:
 - 1) Submit it for additional reviewing,
 - 2) Give it back to the author for later elaboration, after which it will be reviewed,
 - 3) Refuse publishing.
21. The conclusion given in the result of the second review is final and unchangeable.
22. If the material has been refused publishing, the author will be informed (e-mail letter) about it, where reason(s) for refusal is(are) noted.
23. The editorial has to provide relevant conditions for preservation of reviews of the manuscripts. The reviews of the manuscripts are kept under the defined order of the legislation of the Republic of Armenia.
24. All opinions are kept in the editorial, and they are submitted to the Higher Qualification Committee on demand.