

**FEDERAL STATE BUDGETARY ENTERPRISE
“ALL-RUSSIAN GEOLOGICAL RESEARCH INSTITUTE
OF A. P. KARPINSKY”**

APPROVED

Editor-in-Chief of the scholarly journal
Regional Geology and Metallogeny



M. A. Tkachenko
(initials, last name)

2025

PEER REVIEW POLICY

of the scholarly journal

REGIONAL GEOLOGY AND METALLOGENY

(“Regional’naya Geologiya i Metallogeniya” / “Regional Geology and Metallogeny”)

ISSN 0869-7892 (Print)

<https://reggeomet.elpub.ru/>

Saint Petersburg

2025

PEER REVIEW

All the manuscripts submitted to the editorial office of the journal *Regional Geology and Metallogeny* (thereinafter — journal) undergo a peer review process in order to provide an objective expert assessment. The peer review period is up to two months after the manuscript being registered in the editorial office. Exceptionally, the journal's Editorial Board can prolong the peer review period.

The journal provides a single-blind peer review, which means the reviewer knows the authors, but the authors do not know the reviewer. The editorial office is responsible for connecting the authors and reviewers.

The editorial office retains peer review reports for five years. Upon request, the editorial office sends copies of peer review reports to the Ministry of Science and Higher Education of the Russian Federation.

The expert assessment involves the following stages: formal assessment of the manuscript content, its peer review, and final assessment.

Formal assessment of the manuscript content

It involves examining the manuscript for complying with the journal sections and requirements for its structure and layout (refer to Appendix 2 of the document *Guide for Authors* dated 17.02.2025). *Antiplagiat*, the licensed software system for detecting textual borrowings in research papers, checks the manuscript content for originality. When the originality is minimum 90 percent, the manuscript can proceed to the next stage for assessment.

If the software system *Antiplagiat* detects the text that generative artificial intelligence has created, the editorial office reserves the right to examine the volume of the generated text from the manuscript and its rewriting quality. The selected reviewer provides a final decision whether to include such a text in the manuscript.

Peer review

Professionals respected for their expertise in the manuscript subject area are involved in its peer review. The Editor-in-Chief, its deputies, and field-specific members of the Editorial Council as agreed by the Editor-in-Chief can announce the reviewers. They can be internal reviewers — Karpinsky Institute's employees and external ones — from other organizations in Saint Petersburg and beyond; employees of regional branches, regional science centers and offices of the Russian Academy of Sciences are of top priority. The journal's Deputy Editors-in-Chief and members of the Editorial Council can become reviewers. Questionable judgments on publishing research papers (positive and negative feedback on one manuscript) encourage the editorial office to seek

a meta peer review. Meta peer reviewers are the journal's Deputy Editors-in-Chief and members of the Editorial Council.

When sending the peer review report to the editorial office, the reviewer consents to have the provided peer review report published or disseminated via research databases closed access. Reviewers sign a cooperative agreement if their peer review report is published open access (Appendix 1).

Manuscript assessment criteria are as follows:

- research rationale (correspondence of the manuscript content to modern achievements in the addressed field of study);
- novelty and scientific merit of the obtained findings (new contribution to the field of study; exploring new subjects, problems, phenomena; determination of previously unknown properties, patterns, connections);
- data description (correspondence of the manuscript title to the content, logics and consistency, volume and structure, research methods, statistical data processing);
- data presentation (scientific style, terminology; informative value of figures and tables; quality of figures, diagrams, and charts);
- science sources citation (quality and completeness of the References list, relevance of references to the sources, modern and foreign sources);
- informative value of the abstract (including the research topic, aim, methods, findings, and inferences; novelty, scientific merit, and practical significance) and keywords (matching the research topic and covering the subject and terminology area);
- assets of the research paper;
- limitations of the research paper (critical remarks).

The reviewer finally advises on the manuscript publication:

- It is recommended to publish the manuscript as a research article without changes.
- It is recommended to publish the manuscript as a research article after making the reviewer's major revisions.
- Inviting an expert for additionally reviewing the manuscript is required.
- It is recommended to publish the manuscript as a research article after making the reviewer's minor revisions.
- The manuscript cannot be published in the journal, since it does not match its subject area and requirements, is irrelevant.

When signing the peer review report (Appendix 2), the reviewer acknowledges no time limit storage and processing of their personal data listed in table 2. The published articles are

uploaded on the Scientific electronic library website eLIBRARY.RU, with closed-access peer review report texts included. There are also the reviewer's closed-access data.

The authors have the right to read copies of the peer review reports and respond to the reviewers' comments.

The journal's editorial office decides on the manuscript to be published, with the peer review reports considered and upon consent of the Deputy Editors-in-Chief or Editorial Council members who have announced the reviewers. The unofficial positive feedback enables the editorial office to include the manuscript, which is accepted for publication, in the annual publishing plan. The research articles are published in order of submission priority, after filling the journal sections or its thematic issues.

Upon providing the reviewer's minor revisions, the authors receive their manuscript accompanied with the peer review report and the editorial office's comments. The authors submit their updated manuscript (edited as per the reviewer's comments) and peer review report response (Appendix 3) (including the editing description) within two weeks after receiving the peer review report and editorial office's comments. The reviewer's major revisions can be made for one month maximum. The Editor-in-Chief, Deputy Editors-in-Chief, or a field-specific member of the Editorial Council receive the revised materials for approval (additional reviewing or editing).

The journal's editorial office has the right to reject the authors' manuscript submission or send it for additional reviewing:

- if the manuscript does not match the journal's subject area and (or) its originality is under 90 percent (as per the software system *Antiplagiat* report); the manuscript authors will be provided with the text check results note;
- if the *Antiplagiat* report contains suspicious information about the text fully generated by artificial intelligence;
- if the manuscript content does not meet the criteria of a research rationale, novelty, and scientific merit of the obtained findings;
- if the authors miss the deadline of revising the manuscript and (or) there are no grounds for the authors disagreeing with the reviewer's comments.

The authors receive an opinion on reasons for their manuscript rejection (Appendix 4).

The manuscript registration can be canceled if the authors voluntarily withdraw it from the journal in writing (Appendix 5).

Final assessment

After the decision on the manuscript to be published is made, it undergoes literary and copy editing. Some changes in the manuscript, which can hinder the author's message completeness, are to be agreed. The authors also approve the article layout.

The authors' materials, including literary and copy edits, are stored in the journal's editorial office as archival for three years.

Then the research articles are uploaded in the section *Online First* (on the journal's website <https://reggeomet.elpub.ru/>) after all the stages of expert assessment completed and the authors approving the article layout, which reduces the publication data and grants faster access to the current research findings.

The only difference of research articles in the section *Online First* from those in *Current* is the lacking volume and issue numbers, and cited pages.

After being approved for press, there are added only relevant volume and issue numbers, and cited pages in the bibliographic entry for citation; only then the *Current* section contains the research article details.

COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT

with the editorial office of the scholarly journal *Regional Geology and Metallogeny*
Saint Petersburg, Russia _____ **20** _____

The editorial office of the scholarly journal *Regional Geology and Metallogeny*, whose founder and publisher is the Federal state budgetary enterprise “All-Russian Geological Research Institute of A. P. Karpinsky” (Karpinsky Institute) thereafter referred to as **Editorial Office**, represented by the Editor-in-Chief M. A. Tkachenko, acting under the Charter, as party of the first part, initials and last name (full affiliation) thereafter referred to as **Reviewer**, as party of the second part, concluded this agreement (thereinafter — **Agreement**) as follows.

1. Subject matter of the Agreement

1.1. Upon entry of the **Agreement** into force, **the Reviewer** assumes an obligation to review articles, as required in the procedure to peer review manuscripts submitted to the **Editorial Office**, as per the scientific majors for PhD and doctoral degree conferral:

- ☐ 1.6.1. General and regional geology. Geotectonics and geodynamics (Geology and Mineralogy)
- ☐ 1.6.2. Paleontology and stratigraphy (Geology and Mineralogy)
- ☐ 1.6.3. Petrology, volcanology (Geology and Mineralogy)
- ☐ 1.6.4. Mineralogy, crystallography. Geochemistry, geochemical methods of mineral exploration (Geology and Mineralogy)
- ☐ 1.6.5. Lithology (Geology and Mineralogy)
- ☐ 1.6.9. Geophysics (Geology and Mineralogy)
- ☐ 1.6.10. Geology, prospecting, and exploration of solid minerals, minerageny (Geology and Mineralogy)
- ☐ 1.6.11. Geology, prospecting, and exploration of petroleum fields (Geology and Mineralogy)

1.2. The **Reviewer** provides detailed and supported arguments when preparing the peer review of the manuscript according to its assessment criteria. The **Reviewer** informs about their decision whether to publish the manuscript as a research article in a peer review report.

1.3. The peer review report includes:

1.3.1. The manuscript information: title, code (article numbering practiced by the **Publisher**), the author's (authors') initials and last name.

1.3.2. The **Reviewer** information: first, patronymic, and last names (in the Russian language and transliterated); degree, academic rank, position (in Russian and English); full affiliation (in Russian and English); identification numbers: ORCID, Scopus Author ID, ResearcherID (Web of Science), RSCI SPIN-code; e-mail address.

1.3.3. Manuscript assessment criteria:

- research rationale (correspondence of the manuscript content to modern achievements in the addressed field of study);
- novelty and scientific merit of the obtained findings (new contribution to the field of study; exploring new subjects, problems, phenomena; determination of previously unknown properties, patterns, connections);
- data description (correspondence of the manuscript title to the content, logics and consistency, volume and structure, research methods, statistical data processing);
- data presentation (scientific style, terminology; informative value of figures and tables; quality of figures, diagrams, and charts);
- science sources citation (quality and completeness of the References list, relevance of references to the sources, modern and foreign sources);
- informative value of the abstract (including the research topic, aim, methods, findings, and inferences; novelty, scientific merit, and practical significance) and keywords (matching the research topic and covering the subject and terminology area);
- assets of the research paper;
- limitations to the research paper (critical remarks).

1.4. At the end of the peer review report, the **Reviewer** puts the date signed; their position; full affiliation, city; degree, academic rank (if available). The **Reviewer** certifies the peer review report by their signature and seal in their organization's Human Resources department.

1.5. The completed peer review report is formatted as a text document and its scanned copy (certified with the **Reviewer's** signature and seal in the **Reviewer's** affiliated organization).

1.6. The manuscript peer review process takes no more than two weeks after the **Reviewer's** consent orally or in writing. In exceptional cases, the process can be prolonged if the **Editorial Office** agrees.

1.7. The published articles are uploaded on the Scientific electronic library website eLIBRARY.RU with open-access peer review report texts included. There are also the **Reviewer's** open-access data.

2. Rights and obligations of the Parties

2.1. The **Editorial Office** guarantees that the submitted manuscript:

2.1.1. Is an original paper not published in any printed and (or) electronic editions.

2.1.2. Does not contain materials for non-open access publication under the Russian Federation legislative acts and that publishing and distributing it by the **Publisher** will not result in disclosing sensitive (classified) information including official, business secrets.

2.2. The **Editorial Office** provides the **Reviewer** with the soft copy of the manuscript and supplementary data (if available).

2.3. The **Editorial Office** receives completed peer review reports.

2.4. The **Editorial Office** sends the manuscript for the authors to revise as per reviewers' comments; they receive an updated manuscript (edited as per the **Reviewer's** comments) and peer review response.

2.5. The **Editorial Office** decides on the manuscript to be published after considering the data credibility and scientific value of the paper. The final decision whether to publish the research article primarily depends on the current law regulations of defamation, copyright, and plagiarism.

2.6. The **Editorial Office** cannot disclose neither any information about the submitted manuscript nor the **Reviewer's** personal data to third parties.

2.7. The **Reviewer** anonymously reviews the manuscript by following the single-blind peer review policy when the reviewer knows the authors, but the authors do not know the reviewer.

2.8. The **Reviewer** notifies the **Editorial Office** if they feel they are not qualified or objective enough to review the manuscript, if there is a conflict of interests with the author or organization, and if they do not have sufficient time to. The **Reviewer** has to inform the **Editorial Office** about these conditions and request to be excluded from the manuscript peer review.

2.9. The **Reviewer** performs an unbiased peer review of the authors' materials:

2.9.1. Objectively and reasonably assesses the research findings in terms of the research rationale, novelty and scientific merit of the obtained findings, data description, data presentation, science sources citation, informative value of the abstract, assets of the research paper, limitations of the research paper.

2.9.2. States objective and essential comments and recommendations to increase scientific quality of the manuscript.

2.9.3. Finally advises on the manuscript publication (recommend publishing the manuscript as a research article without changes or after making the reviewer's major revisions, require additional reviewing, after making the reviewer's minor revisions, cannot be published) on the basis of specific facts and produces evidence of their decision.

2.10. The **Reviewer** ensures confidentiality of the manuscript content and does not use the unpublished manuscript materials to advantage without the authors' written consent. Only the **Reviewer's** statement about the incredible or falsified materials described in the manuscript evidences a confidentiality breach.

There is no royalty fee for the **Reviewer** granting the rights to the **Editorial Office**.

2.11. The **Reviewer** also grants the **Editorial Office** the right to store and process their personal data without time limit as follows:

- first, patronymic, and last names;
- degree and academic rank;
- position, full affiliation;
- office address (locality, country);
- identification numbers: ORCID, Scopus Author ID, ResearcherID (Web of Science), RSCI SPIN-code;
- contact telephone number, e-mail address;
- date of birth, passport details, postal address (only to sign the **Agreement**).

2.12. The **Reviewer** acknowledges their open-access peer review reports and open-access data being transferred and uploaded on the Scientific electronic library website.

The personal data are to be stored and processed in different databases and information systems, for being included in analysis and statistics reports.

The **Editorial Office** is eligible to transfer these data for third parties to process and store if the **Reviewer** is notified about this fact, including information about the third party (name and address).

The **Reviewer** withdraws their consent to store and process their personal data by notifying the **Editorial Office** in writing (in any format).

3. Liabilities of the Parties

3.1. Under the Russian Federation law in force, the **Editorial Office** and **Reviewer** incur property liability or any other legal liability for not discharging or improperly discharging their obligations under this **Agreement**.

3.2. The party that has improperly discharged or has not discharged their obligations under this **Agreement** is obliged to indemnify against losses to the other Party, including an expectation loss.

4. Confidentiality

4.1. The conditions of this **Agreement** are confidential and not liable to disclosure.

5. Final provisions

5.1. The Parties' all disputes and disagreements arising from the **Agreement** conditions shall be settled by negotiations, and if they are unproductive, these disputes shall be presented before a court under the law of the Russian Federation in force.

5.2. This **Agreement** shall come into force when the both Parties sign it.

5.3. This **Agreement** shall remain in force until the Parties fully complete their obligations under it.

5.4. This **Agreement** may be terminated if the both Parties agree to sign the relevant termination agreement.

5.5. The unilateral termination of this **Agreement** is possible as the law in force requires or by court order.

5.6. Any amendments and addenda to this **Agreement** shall be valid only if they are made in writing and the both Parties of this **Agreement** sign them.

5.7. In any matter not covered by this **Agreement**, the Parties shall be governed by the Russian Federation legislative acts in force.

5.8. This **Agreement** is made in two copies of equal content and legal force, one for each Party.

5.9. This **Agreement** signed by the Parties shall be scanned and e-mailed to the editorial office of the scholarly journal *Regional Geology and Metallogeny* (izdatel@karpinskyinstitute.ru). The scanned **Agreement** has legal effect until the Parties exchange the original **Agreement** in a hard copy.

The parties have agreed that in exceptional cases, as article 160 of the Civil Law of the Russian Federation requires, when it is very difficult for the **Reviewer** to sign the document it is allowed and admitted to reproduce the personal written signature on the document by copying it mechanically, electronically or any other way, which will be as legally effective as the **Reviewer's** original signature.

6. Details of the Parties

Reviewer:

First, patronymic, last names
Date of birth: 00.00.0000
Passport: ... (serial number) issued ...
(issuing authority name) 00.00.0000 (date
of issue), subdivision code ...

Publisher:

Federal state budgetary enterprise "All-Russian Geological Research Institute of A. P. Karpinsky" (Karpinsky Institute)
Registered office located at 74 Sredny pr.,
Saint Petersburg, 199106

Postal address: ... (house number), ...
(building number), ... (apartment number),
... (street), ... (locality), ... (country), ...
(postcode)

E-mail address: ...

Signature:

_____/Initials Last name/

Bank account details:

Federal Treasury Department
in Saint Petersburg (Karpinsky Institute,
personal account 20726B03510)
individual taxpayer number 7801300136,
tax registration reason code 780101001
operating account 032146430000000017200

Beneficiary bank:

Bank of Russia, Northwestern General
Administration // Federal Treasury
Department in Saint Petersburg
Saint Petersburg
sort code 014030106
correspondent account
40102810945370000005

_____/M. A. Tkachenko/

PEER REVIEW REPORT

Table 1. Manuscript data

Manuscript information	Details
Title	<i>Example:</i> Харгинская золотоносная рудно-россыпная система Приамурской золотоносной провинции
Code	<i>Example:</i> 18.10.24C
Authors	<i>Example:</i> В. А. Степанов, А. В. Мельников

Table 2. Reviewer's background

Reviewer information	Details
First, patronymic, and last names (in the Russian language)	<i>Example:</i> Иван Николаевич Бобров
First, patronymic, and last names (transliterated)	<i>Example:</i> Ivan N. Bobrov
Degree, academic rank, position (in the Russian language)	<i>Example:</i> доктор геолого-минералогических наук, профессор, главный научный сотрудник
Degree, academic rank, position (in the English language)	<i>Example:</i> DSc (Geology and Mineralogy), Professor, Chief researcher
Affiliation (in the Russian language)	<i>Example:</i> Федеральное государственное бюджетное учреждение «Всероссийский научно-исследовательский геологический институт им. А. П. Карпинского»
Affiliation (in the English language)	<i>Example:</i> All-Russian Geological Research Institute of A. P. Karpinsky
ORCID	<i>Example:</i> https://orcid.org/0000-0001-2345-6789
Scopus Author ID	<i>Example:</i> 12345678901
ResearcherID (Web of Science)	<i>Example:</i> J-1234-5678
RCI SPIN-code	<i>Example:</i> 8765-4321
E-mail address	<i>Example:</i> 1234@mail.ru

Table 3. Peer review

Manuscript assessment criteria	Details
Research rationale (correspondence of the manuscript content to modern achievements in the addressed field of study)	<i>Please, provide the peer review of the manuscript by following its assessment criteria on the left.</i>
Novelty and scientific merit of the obtained findings (new contribution to the field of study; exploring new subjects, problems, phenomena; determination of previously unknown properties, patterns, connections)	
Data description (correspondence of the manuscript title to the content, logics and consistency, volume and structure, research methods, statistical data processing)	
Data presentation (scientific style, terminology; informative value of figures and tables; quality of figures, diagrams, and charts)	
Science sources citation (quality and completeness of the References list, relevance of references to the sources, modern and foreign sources)	
Informative value of the abstract (including the research topic, aim, methods, findings, and inferences; novelty, scientific merit, and practical significance) and keywords (matching the research topic and covering the subject and terminology area)	
Assets of the research paper	
Limitations of the research paper (critical remarks)	
Final recommendation	<i>Please, leave only one recommendation about the manuscript publication possibility:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It is recommended to publish the manuscript as a research article without changes. - It is recommended to publish the manuscript as a research article after making the reviewer's major revisions. - Inviting an expert for additionally reviewing the manuscript is required. - It is recommended to publish the manuscript as a research article after making the reviewer's minor revisions.

Manuscript assessment criteria	Details
	- The manuscript cannot be published in the journal, since it does not match its subject area and requirements, is irrelevant.

Date

Position, full affiliation, city, degree, academic

rank

Initials Last name

*Please, certify the peer review report by your signature and seal
in your organization's Human Resources department*

To the editorial office of the scholarly journal

Regional Geology and Metallogeny

The editorial office received the manuscript on 00.00.0000.

The author(s) received the peer review report on 00.00.0000.

PEER REVIEW REPORT RESPONSE

to the manuscript ... (Title)

The author(s) is (are) grateful to the Reviewer for perusing their research paper and making critical remarks. As the esteemed Reviewer's recommendations suggest, the author(s) has (have) made the following revisions in the manuscript:

1. ... *(first revision)*.
2. ... *(second revision)*.
3. ... *(third revision)*.
4. ... *(etc.)*.

In the respected Reviewer's opinion, the manuscript can be published in the journal *Regional Geology and Metallogeny* after relevant revisions being made.

The author(s) agree(s) (strongly disagree(s)) with the Reviewer's remark no. 2 ... *(remark itself)*. The author(s) is (are) convinced of ... *(supported argument)*.

The author(s) also agree(s) (disagree(s)) with the Reviewer's remark no. 5 ... *(remark itself)*. In their (common) opinion, ... *(supported argument)*.

I (We) appreciate the editorial office of the journal *Regional Geology and Metallogeny* attending closely to the manuscript.

Yours faithfully,

author(s)

To the author(s) of the scholarly journal

Regional Geology and Metallogeny:

... (first and last names)

The editorial office received the manuscript on 00.00.0000.

OPINION

on the manuscript rejection ... (Title)

The editorial office of the journal *Regional Geology and Metallogeny* has formally assessed the manuscript content and has to refuse its publication to the author(s) for the following reason(s):

☐ the manuscript does not correspond to the subject area of the journal *Regional Geology and Metallogeny*;

☐ the manuscript originality is under 90 percent (based on the report of the *Antiplagiat* software system (the statement of the manuscript text check results is provided)).

The editorial office of the journal *Regional Geology and Metallogeny* has to refuse the manuscript publication to the author(s) by following the peer review results:

☐ the manuscript content does not correspond to criteria of a research rationale, novelty, and scientific merit of the obtained findings;

☐ the author(s) has (have) missed the deadline to revise the manuscript;

☐ there are no arguments that the author(s) disagree(s) with the reviewer's critical remarks.

Yours sincerely,

Editorial office

Journal *Regional Geology and Metallogeny*

To the editorial office of the scholarly journal

Regional Geology and Metallogeny

The editorial office received the manuscript on 00.00.0000.

MANUSCRIPT CANCELLATION

... (*Title*)

I (We), ... (*first name and last name; affiliation*), voluntarily withdraw our manuscript ...
(*Title*) from the journal *Regional Geology and Metallogeny* for the following reason(s):

- ☐ disagreement with the formal assessment results of the manuscript content;
- ☐ refusal to make minor revisions;
- ☐ refusal to make major revisions in the manuscript as per reviewers' comments;
- ☐ disagreement with another expert's additional reviewing;
- ☐ disapproval of some changes in the manuscript during the final assessment;
- ☐ _____.

Yours faithfully,

author(s)