

## **REVIEW OF THE ARTICLE**

| Title: |  |
|--------|--|
|        |  |

Author(s):

| Evaluation criteria  | Low |   |   |   | High |
|--|-----|---|---|---|------|
| please enter the appropriate rating                              | 1   | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5    |
| Does the article correspond to the topic of the journal          |     |   |   |   |      |
| 2. Topicality of the problem                                     |     |   |   |   |      |
| 3. The quality of analysis and scientific evidence               |     |   |   |   |      |
| Organization of the structure and readability of the publication |     |   |   |   |      |
| 5. Contribution to theory or practice                            |     |   |   |   |      |
| 6. Final rating  |     |   |   |   |      |

Note: The final grade does not have to be the average of the grades issued

## Recommendation of the Reviewer

- Accept as an article without corrections
- Accept as an article after making major corrections
- Reject (if the publication does not show larger values)

## General comments:

Detailed comments, suggested changes and corrections:

## The Reviewer's statement

I declare, that:

- 1. I am not a direct co-worker of the author / authors of the reviewed work.
- 2. I do not remain in a family or legal relationship with the author of the work.
- 3. There is no immediate conflict of interest.
- 4. There is no indirect conflict of interest.

| 5. I will treat matters  | s of review as co | nfidential. |           |  |
|--------------------------|-------------------|-------------|-----------|--|
| First name and last name | Date              | Citz        | Signature |  |