

The article title: \_\_\_\_\_

Evaluation criteria: (Please indicate the proposed assessment.)

**Level of knowledge:**

- Very high
- High
- Good
- Satisfactory
- Unacceptable

**Novelty:**

- current issues addressed
- relatively current issues addressed
- outdated issues addressed

**Originality:**

- very high cognitive value – totally different from other publications, clearly distinguished “contribution” author
- high cognitive value – significantly different from other publications
- average cognitive value
- low cognitive value – is not much different from other publications

**Content:**

- highly theoretical
- tends towards theoretical
- balanced theory and practice
- tends toward practical
- highly practical

**Does the title reflect to content?**

- completely compatible
- sufficiently compatible
- incompatible

**The reference to the recent literature:**

- aptly chosen bibliography - properly documented sources of information (relevant and timely)
- sufficiently selected bibliography
- inadequately selected bibliography - significantly different from the standard monograph

**Is the number of references sufficient?**

- Yes
- No

**It is logical and coherent:**

- arrangement of their contents completely logical and consistent - precisely placed on the arguments and conclusions; scientifically precise language used, the logical correctness of the wording
- sufficiently correct arrangement of content
- inconsistent - significantly different from the standard monograph

**Please assess the publication from 0 to 100:**

**Excellent: 90-100; Very Good: 79-89; Good: 70-78; Acceptable: 60-69; Weak: 0-59**

**Recommendation:**

- positive evaluation - publication is consistent with the standards, the content is accurate and complete - publication of accepted
- assessment of the correctness of the wording of conditional - publication meets the standards, it is desirable to improve - the publication will be accepted after the proposed changes
- negative evaluation - Published substantially incompatible with the standards, the content includes basic errors or incorrectly written - Published rejected

**Constructive comments to the author(s) would be appreciated.**

Title, name of reviewer:

Date of performance reviews: