***Reviewing procedure RMJ Clinical Ophthalmology***

1. All scientific manuscripts submitted for publication are subject to peer review.
2. Editorial staff states if an manuscripts corresponds to the journal’s profile and design requirements, and sends it first to the executive editor who assesses the scientific value of the article and appoints a reviewer with similar specialization. The articles are reviewed by the members of the Editorial Board, top ophthalmologists of the Russian Federation1.
3. Reviewing time (all period of reviewing procedure is about 3 months) can be extended at reviewer’s request or if the situation so requires.
4. After analyzing the article the reviewer can advise one of the following:

* to publish the article as it is;
* the Journal is interested, but the manuscript is not acceptable in its current form and needs to be revised to be considered for publication;
* the manuscript requires some revisions before it can be accepted;
* the manuscript is not suitable for publication unless the authors conduct further research or collect additional data;
* publication is declined and the reviewers’ comments are provided to the authors

1. All reviewing is confidential. It is conducted by the double-blind method, which means that neither the author, nor the reviewer knows each other’s name. Breach of confidentiality is possible only if there is a reviewer’s statement of consent about reporting his name to the author.
2. If a review has recommended to correct and revise the article, the editorial office secretary sends the text of the review to the author requesting him to take the recommendations into consideration when preparing a new variant of the article or dispose them reasonably (wholly or partially). An article revised by the author is to be reviewed again.
3. If an author and a reviewer have irrepressible conflicts concerning an article, the editorial board has a right to send the article to another reviewer. In conflict situations the decision is made by the editor-in-chief.
4. An article not recommended for publication by a reviewer is not to be re-reviewed. The negative review report is sent to the author by e-mail, fax or by post.
5. Original copies of reviews are kept in the editorial office for five years.

**1Re.:**

The associate editor (or Editor-in-chief) communicates this decision to the authors in a detailed letter that puts forth questions raised in the review process and recommends the revisions needed to meet the standards for publication.  Authors respond to the associate editor with a revised manuscript and letter detailing the changes.  When the manuscript is returned by the author, the associate editor reviews the revised manuscript and decides whether further peer review or statistical review is needed (and often brings the revisions to another editorial meeting for discussion).  If additional outside review is not needed, the manuscript is sent to a deputy editor (or Editor-in-chief) for editing and additional revisions in collaboration with the associate editor and authors.

The Editor-in-chief reviews the final submission and may raise further questions.  The Editor-in-chief is the only person who can officially accept a paper.  The editor’s formal acceptance sends an article into manuscript editing (for copyediting) and production.