

Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv  
Department of General Linguistics, Classical Philology and Neo-Hellenistics Ukraine, Kyiv, 14  
Taras Shevchenko Boulevard, room 141.

**Review of a scientific article in a journal**

"Bulletin of Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv.

Literary Studies. Linguistics. Folklore Studies»

Dear Reviewer! Your assessment of the material's compliance with the design requirements, recommendations for improving the article will be valuable for the author and useful for the editors. Your comments will help to make the final decision on publication the manuscript. The author will have the possibility to read all your comments. The anonymity of your review is guaranteed by the approved "Privacy Policy". The reviewer may not use the results or ideas presented in the peer-reviewed article.

**REVIEWER'S DECLARATION:**

**I declare that:**

- I do not know personally the author (s) of the article I am reviewing
- I know personally the author (s) of the article I am reviewing, but there is no conflict of interest, including:
  - direct personal relations (family, legal relations, marriage);
  - relationships of professional dependence;
  - direct scientific cooperation during the last two years.

Article title:	
Article volume:	
Date of submission	
Review deadline:	

Please select the option that corresponds to your assessment of the text of the peer-reviewed article.

**1. Formulation of the title of the article:**

- It is clear and understandable
- It is not clear enough
- Needs adjustment due to vague wording and / or excessive length
- It is formulated incomprehensibly and / or does not correspond to the content of the article

*Comment:*

**2. Compliance of the subject matter with the journal profile:**

- Fully compliant
- Corresponding partially
- Absolutely not compliant

*Comment:*

**3. Methodological level of the article:**

- Exemplary
- High enough
- Satisfactory
- Unsatisfactory

*Comment:*

**4. Scientific value of the presented material:**

- The material is original and innovative
- The material has already been partially presented in the scientific literature
- The level of scientific novelty is quite low
- Is not of scientific value

*Comment:*

**5. The level of realization of the scientific goal:**

- High
- Fairly high
- Satisfactory
- Unsatisfactory

*Comment:*

**6. Compliance of the structure of the material presentation with the requirements:**

- Fully compliant
- Corresponding partially
- Absolutely not compliant

*Comment:*

**7. Disclosure of the topic:**

- The topic is comprehensive and balanced
- Insufficiently balanced content, but not essential
- Important information is missing or superficial
- Too much attention is paid to some aspects, while others are hardly considered
- The material is unbalanced

*Comment:*

**8. Presentation of the material:**

- Logical and consistent
- Sometimes illogical
- Chaotic

*Comment:*

**9. Convincingness of the given arguments and considerations:**

Quite convincing                       Partly convincing                       Unconvincing

*Comment:*

**10. Scientific elaboration of the material:**

Excellent                       Pretty Good                       Satisfactory                       Poor

*Comment:*

**11. Language of the presented material:**

Clear and understandable  
 Requires minor edits  
 Needs significant corrections  
 Unsatisfactory

*Comment:*

**12. Quality of scientific style:**

Exemplary                       High enough                       Satisfactory                       Unacceptable

*Comment:*

**13. Clarity of terms used in the material:**

Yes                       Partly (not all)                       No

*Comment:*

**14. Scientific specifics of the material:**

Superficial  
 Understandable for non-specialist  
 Understandable for a person who is generally well informed on this topic  
 It is clear only to the expert

*Comment:*

**15. Technical quality of material (text formatting, design of tables, figures):**

Fully meets the requirements of the journal  
 Partly meets the requirements of the journal  
 Absolutely does not meet the requirements of the journal

*Comment:*

**16. References in the text of the article:**

The list of references contains references to the work of all the mentioned scientists  
 The list of references contains sources that are not referenced in the test article  
 Formatting meets the requirements  
 The text contains references to sources that are not in the list of references  
 Contains a significant number of references to educational literature and non-scientific journals

*Comment:*

**17. Compliance of annotations with the requirements:**

- Fully accords
- Accords in part
- Absolutely not according
- The annotation in English needs to be corrected

*Comment:*

**18. Level of adequacy of conclusions:**

- Reasonable, logical and consistent
- Occasionally fuzzy; need adjustment
- Illogical and inconsistent
- Do not correspond to the content of the article

*Comment:*

**19. Application of figures and tables:**

- Relevant, contain information that helps to reveal the content
- Do not fully reflect the scientific results of the study
- Only partially reflect the scientific results of the study
- Inappropriate and inconsistent with the content of the article
- Missing

*Comment:*

**ADDITIONAL COMMENT FOR THE AUTHOR** (*please indicate how the text that needs editing or correction is marked*):

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

**RECOMMENDATION:**

- Recommend for publication
- Publish after minor edits
- Requires significant changes and re-review
- Refuse (requires significant edits; revised material may be resubmitted)
- Refuse to publish without the possibility of re-submission
- Refuse (the subject of the material does not correspond to the profile of the journal)

Reviewer's name:	
Academic degree, position and affiliation of the reviewer:	
Reviewer's signature:	
Reviewer's e-mail:	