

## **Ethic obligations of Reviewers**

1. If a selected reviewer is not sure that his scientific qualification answers the level of researches, presented in a manuscript, he must at once give back a manuscript.
2. A reviewer always must objectively estimate the quality of a manuscript, its experimental and theoretical parts, interpretation and exposition of the material, and also to take into account, how maintenance of the article answers the scientific and linguistically-stylistic standards; to respect intellectual independence of authors.
3. A reviewer must take into account a possibility of conflict of interests in the case when a manuscript is given to him close related to his current or published work. If there are doubts, a reviewer must at once turn a manuscript without a review, saying about the conflict of interests.
4. A reviewer has no right to estimate a manuscript, when he has the personal or professional copulas with an author or the co-author, and if such relations can influence on judgement about the publication of manuscript.
5. A reviewer must apply a manuscript which is the subject for criticizing, as a confidential document: not to show a manuscript to the other persons, not to discuss about it with other colleagues except special cases, when a reviewer requires somebody's special consultation.
6. Reviewers must adequately explain and argue reasoning in relation to the article, for editors' and authors' understanding, what their remarks are based on. Any statement that certain supervisions, conclusions, arguments and others like were already published, must be accompanied by a reference to the corresponding source.
7. A reviewer must mark any cases of insufficient or improper quoting by authors of works of the other scientists, which have direct attitude toward the article under criticizing, and also to take into account that a remark on the insufficient quoting can be regarded by the author of manuscript of the own researches of a reviewer as preconceived.
8. A reviewer must pay editor's attention to any substantial likeness between this manuscript and any published article or any manuscript, simultaneously presented to another printed organ.
9. A reviewer must give a review in time.
10. Reviewers have no authority to use or expose unpublished information, arguments or interpretations which are contained in this article, if there is not a consent of the author on it.