

A review

of the article:
by author(s):

Reviewed by:
Affiliation:

Assessment of selected essential parameters of the article:

1.	Does the title of the article correspond to its content?	corresponds / does not correspond
2.	Compliance of article format with formal requirements (abstract, keywords, length, references).	complies / does not comply
3.	Keyword selection	corresponds / does not correspond
4.	Does the abstract correspond to the article content?	corresponds / does not correspond
5.	Relevance	high / sufficient / insufficient
6.	Originality	high / sufficient / insufficient
7.	Logic and correlation of sections	high / sufficient / insufficient
8.	Findings and conclusions	sufficient / insufficient
9.	Quality of expression (language, style)	high / sufficient / insufficient
10.	Quantity of language examples or evidentiary support	high / sufficient / insufficient
11.	Theoretical relevance (if applicable)	high / sufficient / insufficient
12.	Correspondence of the References to the content	corresponds / does not correspond

Comments and recommendations of the reviewer:

Recommendation:

for unconditional publication / for publication with discussion notes /
for publication after revision / for unconditional refusal of publication.

Signature of the reviewer

Date