

## ***Ethical obligations of reviewers***

1. Reviewing manuscripts is an essential step in the publication process and, thus, in the implementation of the scientific method as such, each scientist is obliged to perform a certain part of the work to peer review.

2. If the selected reviewer is not confident that his qualification corresponds to the level of research presented in the manuscript should reject it promptly.

3. The reviewers should objectively evaluate the quality of experimental information, theoretical information, interpretation, presentation, and reveal of high scientific and literary standards of the manuscript. The reviewer should respect the intellectual independence of authors.

4. The reviewer should consider the possibility of a conflict of interest in the case, when the reviewed manuscript closely relates to the current or published work of the reviewer. If there is any case of this, the reviewer should reject the manuscript without review and report a conflict of interest.

5. The reviewer should not evaluate a manuscript of an author or co-author with whom he has personal or professional connection, and if this relationship can affect the judgment about the manuscript.

6. The reviewer should treat a manuscript as a confidential document. It should not be shown to others or discussed with other colleagues except in special cases, when a reviewer needs special consultation.

7. Reviewers must adequately explain and argue their judgments so that editors and authors may understand the basis for their comments. Any statement, observation, conclusion or argument should be accompanied by appropriate references.

8. The reviewer should mark any cases of insufficient quoting by the authors from the works of other scientists relevant to this work. Note, that by not properly citing research, the reviewer may appear biased. The reviewer should inform the editor regarding any substantial similarity between the manuscript under consideration and any published articles or manuscript submitted concurrently to another journal.

9. The reviewer needs to provide timely feedback.

10. Reviewers should not use or disclose unpublished information, arguments, or interpretations contained in a manuscript under consideration, if there is no consent from the author. However, when the information indicates that some of the reviewer's own research may prove unsuccessful, the termination of this work by the reviewer does not contradict ethical standards.