
REVIEW OF THE ARTICLE

Title of the article

Registration number (*Corresponds to the file name of the article*) _____

1. General evaluation of the article

(When filling in the table elements, the reviewer moves the "V" symbol to the required cell)

No.	CRITERIA – QUESTIONS	ANSWERS				
		YES	CAN BE IMPROVED	MUST BE IMPROVED	NO	NOT APPLICABLE
1.	<i>Is the title corresponding to the content of the article?</i>	V				
2.	<i>Will the title of the article be interesting to the international scientific audience and does not require any correction?</i>	V				
3.	<i>Is the abstract corresponding to the formal requirements of the journal (volume - 2000-2500 characters, style, no common phrases, etc.), is written correctly, literally does not duplicate the "Conclusions"?</i>	V				
4.	<i>Does the abstract summarize the content of the article in a clear and concise manner?</i>	V				
5.	<i>Have the keywords been chosen correctly (4-6 words or phrases), do they correspond to its content?</i>	V				
6.	<i>Are the keywords not duplicated in the title of the article?</i>	V				
7.	<i>Does the introduction provide sufficient background and include all relevant references?</i>	V				
8.	<i>Is the purpose of the article clearly stated and has it been achieved?</i>	V				
9.	<i>Have the research methods been determined and are they appropriate for the aim of the research?</i>	V				
10.	<i>Does the study introduce a new approach to the subject matter and does it contribute to the development of the history of science and technology?</i>	V				

11.	<i>Has the study been correctly organized and internally structured?</i>	V				
12.	<i>Is the content of the study clearly presented?</i>	V				
13.	<i>Is the article containing the optimal amount of graphic material for this type of research?</i>	V				
14.	<i>Are all figures clear and well-presented?</i>	V				
15.	<i>Are all tables clear and well-presented?</i>	V				
16.	<i>Are the "Results and Discussion" containing links to similar works, allowing to compare results with already available data?</i>	V				
17.	<i>Are the conclusions specific, correspond to the purpose and the title of the article, not duplicated literally in abstracts?</i>	V				
18.	<i>Are all works cited in the text present in the reference (and vice versa)?</i>	V				
19.	<i>Are the references cited in this manuscript appropriate and relevant to this research?</i>	V				
20.	<i>Does the text of the article not contain spelling and grammatical mistakes, typographical errors?</i>	V				
21.	<i>Is the study written correctly in its formal aspect (i.e. linguistic correctness, style, footnotes, bibliography)?</i>	V				

2. Copyright

(When filling in the table elements, the reviewer moves the "V" symbol from the required cell)

V	<i>The article does not bear any signs of plagiarism according to the copyright law.</i>
	<i>The article bears the signs of plagiarism according to the copyright law, i.e. the scope of unjustified use of elements from elsewhere raises doubt (<u>examples required</u>).</i>

3. Publication Ethics

(When filling in the table elements, the reviewer moves the "V" symbol to the required cell)

QUESTIONS	YES*	NO
<i>Do you have any potential conflicts of interest with regard to this paper?</i>		V
<i>Did you detect inappropriate self-citations by authors?</i>		V
<i>Do you have any other ethical concerns about this study?</i>		V

***Detailed comments** (Required if the answer to the questions was different than 'NO'. The comments can be continued on the following pages):

.....

.....

.....

4. Final evaluation of the article

(When filling in the table elements, the reviewer moves the "V" symbol to the required cell)

Overall Recommendation	ANSWER
<i>Accept in present form (no alterations suggested)</i>	V
<i>Accept after minor revisions (no second peer review)</i>	
<i>Reconsider after major revisions (second peer review required)</i>	
<i>Rejected</i>	

5. Comments and suggested amendments

Detailed comments *(Required if the answer to the questions was different than 'YES' in part 1; 'The article does not bear any signs of plagiarism according to the copyright law' in part 2; and 'Accept in present form (no alterations suggested)' in part 4). The comments can be continued on the following pages:*

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

Suggested amendments before the publication of the article:

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

Reviewer _____

(first name and surname; scientific degree/title)

(scientific unit where the reviewer is employed)

Date _____ **Signature**** _____ *(First name Last name)*

****Notice:** *A completed review form without a handwritten signature sent by email is deemed to be signed.*