

---

**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!**

---