**REVIEW**

of the article \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**1. Relevance to the Journal’s specialization**

Choose the appropriate section or state that there is lack of relevance

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Economic Theory |  |
| Economic-mathematical Modeling |  |
| Regional and Municipal Economy |  |
| Business Economics and Administration |  |
| Current Issues of Accounting, Auditing and Economic Analysis |  |

**2. Assessment of the scientific level of the article**

*2.1. Current significance of the problem under consideration (maximum 3 points)*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Is of great significance for solving a certain scientific/practical problem |  |
| Some elements of the article can be used for solving current problems |  |
| Is of no significance |  |

*2.2. Novelty, originality of methods and/or results (maximum 8 points)*

State the novel features of the scientific problem dealt with by the author.

*2.3. Correctness of the content of the article and conclusions drawn (maximum 5 points)*

State how correct and impartial the content and conclusions are, to what extent they correspond to current scientific conceptions in the given field

*2.4. Theoretical and practical significance of the article (maximum 5 points)*

State theoretical and practical significance of the given article.

State what kind of readership the article will be interesting for, assess prospects of its use and quoting after publication.

*2.5. References to sources (maximum 2 points)*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Excellent survey of literature is provided (the number of sources on the list is more than 25) 2 points |  |
| Survey of literature is sufficient (the number of sources on the list meets the Journal’s requirements: 15–25 sources) 1 point |  |
| Survey of literature is not sufficient (the number of sources on the list is less than 15) 0 points |  |
| There are no references to sources (0 points) |  |

State which part of the article requires further revision and elaboration. Publications that have influenced the results of the research but are not stated by the author, if there are any.

**3. General description of the article**

*3.1. Logic and style (maximum 2 points)*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| The article has well-defined structure and is easy to read (1-2 points) |  |
| The article does not have proper structure and is difficult to understand (0 points) |  |
| The article is not structured and unreadable (0 points) |  |

*3.2. Formatting and design of the article in accordance with the Journal’s requirements*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Meet all the requirements |  |
| There are some minor flaws |  |
| Do not meet requirements |  |

State the flaws in formatting.

*3.3. Additional comments*

1.

2.

3.

**4. Conclusion about publication of the article**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Criteria for evaluation of the article | Maximum number of points | The reviewer’s evaluation |
| Current significance of the problem under consideration | 3 |  |
| Novelty, originality of methods and/or results | 8 |  |
| Correctness of the content of the article and conclusions drawn | 5 |  |
| Theoretical and practical significance of the article | 5 |  |
| References to sources | 2 |  |
| Logic and style | 2 |  |
| **TOTAL** | **25** |  |

Note: Evaluation scale (points)

Article does not meet requirements of the Journal and does not fit its scientific level 0–10

Essential revision of the content and additional peer reviewing are required 11–17

The article may be published after the criticisms are addressed 18–20

The article meets all the Journal’s requirements and can be published unconditionally 21–25
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