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**REVIEWER’S QUESTIONNAIRE**

The title of the article\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | Does the essence of the article correspond to the subject of the issue? | | Yes | Partly | No |
| 2 | Does the title of the article correspond to its contents? | | Yes | Partly | No |
| 3 | Is the structure of the article logical? Does it correspond to its essence? | | Yes | Partly | No |
| 4 | The level of completeness and argumentation of the disclosure of the relevance of the topic is | | High | Average | Low |
| 5 | Does the article contain the elements of scientific novelty? | | Yes | Partly | No |
| 6 | Are the given conclusions based on theoretical analysis and/or experimental results? | | Yes | Partly | No |
| 7 | Is there a need to change the size of the article? | | Enlarge | No | Decrease |
| 8 | Does the abstract/annotation reveals the essence of the main results of the research? | | Yes | Partly | No |
| 9 | Do the keywords correspond to the essence of the article? | | Yes | Partly | No |
| 10 | Are the following tables and figures relevant? | | Extend | Acceptable | Cut down |
| 11 | Are the references sufficient, topical and relevant? | | Extend | Acceptable | Cut down |
| 12 | Is the language of the article scientific? | | Yes | Partly | No |
| 13 | Lexical and grammatical quality of the language of the article | | High | Average | Low |
| 14 | **Conclusion on the issue whether the article is suitable for publishing** | a) suitable in its present form | | | |
| b) suitable with some minor changes | | | |
| c) can be suitable after proper improvement | | | |
| d) unsuitable (underline the right variant)  - does not correspond to the subject of the issue  - inadequate research methodology  - insufficient theoretical / empirical reasoning of the results  - other (note)\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ | | | |
| 15 | Does the article require a new review after improvement in case of variants b) and c) | | | Yes | No |

Please, add your comment, including possible recommendations for article improving:

………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
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Place of Seal the signature is certified by an authorized person at the reviewer’s main place of work