



Title of the reviewed article:

.....
.....

01) General value of the paper:

- an original, innovative paper,
- the paper contains new elements,
- the paper does not contain an element of novelty.

02) Does the content of the article correspond to the journal's profile?

- yes,
- partly,
- no.

03) Is the length of the paper consistent with the journal's requirements?

- yes,
- partly,
- no.

04) Is the aim of the article clearly specified and realized?

- yes,
- partly,
- no.

05) Does the paper's title match its content?

- yes,
- partly,
- no.

06) Does the article have a logical layout?

- yes,
- partly,
- no.

07) Has the covered issue been discussed clearly and logically?

- yes,
- partly,
- no.

08) Do conclusions result from the content?

- yes,
- partly,
- no.

09) Research material / data sources:

- well-selected and sufficient,
- well-selected but insufficient,
- badly-selected or insufficient,
- non-applicable.

10) Research methods:

- well-selected and explained,
- well-selected but not explained enough,
- badly-selected,
- non-applicable.

11) Interpretation of research results:

- completely correct,
- partly correct,
- incorrect,
- non-applicable.

12) Is the language of article correct?

- yes,
- partly,
- no.

13) Is the text adequately illustrated /tables, figures/?

- yes,
- too modest,
- lack.

14) Is the subject bibliography sufficient?

- yes,
- too extensive,
- too modest.

15) Suggested corrections /can be noted in text/:

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

16) Possible justification of answers to questions in points 1-14:

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

CONCLUSIONS /please mark the proper one/:

- The article is worth publishing in the author's version.
- The article is worth publishing in the author's version with possible small changes.
- The article can be published after corrections suggested by the reviewer.
- The article must be radically revised.
- The article is not suitable for publication because:
 - It does not match the journal profile.
 - It contains mistakes regarding data sources or applied methods.
 - The quoted literature of the subject is insufficient.
 - It does not meet the language requirements.
 - Other reasons / please specify /:

.....

.....

.....

.....

Would you like to see the revised version of the article:

- yes,
- no.

✂ -----

.....
Date and signature

.....
Could you please write in Latin alphabet your name and surname plus full name of the scientific institution (in English)

The review is anonymous. Neither the author nor the reviewer knows the other's identity.