
Практический семинар для авторов
*"Подготовка научной статьи для
публикации в международном
журнале"*



23 ноября 2010 г



ELSEVIER

Ирина Б. Вендик, проф., д.ф.м.н.
С.-Петербургский Электротехнический
университет «ЛЭТИ»

И.Б. Вендик – член редколлегии международных журналов



Как выполняется рецензирование статей?

- Выполняется общая оценка статьи
- В деталях анализируется содержательная часть статьи
- Оценивается качество написания
- Дается рекомендация: печатать или отклонить
- Если необходимо, приводятся конкретные замечания и рекомендации

Примеры критериев оценки

- Общая оценка статьи:

Paper Rating:

- Outstanding
 - Very Good
 - Good
 - Fair
 - Poor
-

Оценка содержательной части

For original contributions:

- 1. Does this paper present new ideas or results that have not been previously published?
Yes Minor No
- 2. Are the results/ideas presented in this paper important for this Journal?
Definitely Perhaps No
- 3. Is the paper *technically* correct?
Yes No Not sure
- 4. Are the contents supported/verified by independent evidence (measurements, prior results, etc.)?
Yes No
- 5. Is previous related work adequately **referenced**?
Yes No
(If not, indicate omissions.)

Оценка содержательной части

For review papers:

- 1. Does the paper present a critical assessment of the current state-of-the-art?
Yes **Not adequately** **No**
- 2. Have all the previous important publications in this area been referred to and commented on?
(if not, list the important omissions.)
Yes **Mostly** **No**
- 3. To what extent is this review useful to the «XXX» community?
Much **Average** **Little**

Качество написания

- 1. Rate the organization and readability of the paper.

10 - - - 9 - - - 8 - - - 7 - - - 6 - - - 5 - - - 4 - - - 2 - - - 1

Clear, concise, effective (10-6)

Obscure, verbose, disorganized (5-1)

- 3. Is the paper concise for publication?

Yes **No**

4. Is the grammar/spelling adequate for publication? (Please note errors on manuscript.)

Yes **No**

- 5. Is the **abstract** an appropriate and adequate digest of the work?

Yes **No**

ДОПОЛНИТЕЛЬНЫЕ ОЦЕНКИ

- **Paper Interesting**
Yes **No**
 - **Good Use of Space:**
Yes **No**
 - **Proper English**
Yes **No**
 - **Good Title**
Yes **No**
 - **Clear Figures**
Yes **No**
-

Рекомендация рецензента

- 1. Accept as is (or subject to minor changes)
as a Paper
 - 2. Accept subject to suitable revision as a Short Paper
 - 3. Accept with major revision and resubmit
 - 4. Reject, do not reconsider
 - 5. More suitable for publication in another journal such
as _____
-

Спасибо за внимание!
