

**Rules of reviewing the articles
submitted to the journal «Hydrometeorological Research and Forecasting»**

1. All the copies of research articles submitted to the journal «Hydrometeorological Research and Forecasting» are subject to obligatory independent reviewing and check for plagiarism.
2. To the editorial board the authors submit a copy of the article formatted in conformity with «The rules for the authors submitting articles» and «Written materials submission guidelines». The articles which do not conform to the themes covered by the periodical and are not duly formatted are not accepted for consideration.
3. The copies of the articles the editorial board receives are first subject to preliminary examination as regards their conformity to the general publishing requirements. After the preliminary consideration the copy of an article is handed over to the reviewer.
4. The members of the editorial board, as well as the lead specialists - experts in the research area the author of the article deals with can figure as the reviewers of the articles. Specialists working in the same department where the work to be reviewed had been performed are not entitled to be the reviewers of the article. The reviewing is performed confidentially. The reviewers of the articles are informed that the materials they will receive are the intellectual property of the authors and represent the information that is not subject to disclosure.
5. The review must contain an impartial assessment of the article under review, with the reviewer's opinion whether the materials set forth in the article are topical, with his appraisal of the level of the article scientific development, of the concrete specific contribution of the authors, theoretical and practical importance of the stated provisions and conclusions, of shortcomings, if there are any, as well as his opinion on the advisability of the article publication.
6. The following decisions can be taken based on the results of reviewing:
 - to recommend to accept the article for publication;
 - to recommend to accept the article for publication after some small editing, without submitting the article for a new reviewing;
 - to recommend to examine the article after the author updates the article taking into account the points of criticism of the reviewer, with subsequent submission of the article for another reviewing;
 - to recommend to deny the publication of the article (in this case the editorial board has the right to send the copy of the article to another reviewer or to send a well-reasoned negative reply to the author with a copy of the negative review).
7. In the case if the author does not agree with the opinion of the reviewer, the author has the right to address to the editorial staff a well-reasoned request to send his article to another reviewer, advancing relevant arguments in his request. In this case the editorial board sends the article for a new reviewing or sends a substantiated refusal to the author.
8. In the case of a favorable conclusion and provided there are some recommendations as to the article updating, the copy of the article, along with a copy of the review (without the name of the reviewer), is sent for revision. The authors must introduce all the necessary corrections into the final version of the article and to return the corrected text to the editorial board. After the corrections are made, the article is reviewed anew, and the editorial board takes a decision about whether it is possible to publish it.

9. A positive review does not represent sufficient grounds for the publication of the article. It is the editorial board that takes the final conclusion about the advisability of the publication of the article. The editorial staff reserves the right to reduce the size of the article and to edit it from the scientific standpoint.

10. The authors of the disapproved articles will receive a substantiated refusal whose text will be seen and approved by the editor in chief. Thereafter the editorial staff will not get into argument and will not enter into correspondence with the authors of the disapproved articles.

Chief editor of the Journal

Dr. Roman M. Vilfand