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**CHECK LIST FOR REVIEWER**

Review of article \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Please, use the following *ten point* *scale* to evaluate the reviewed article.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Score** | **Criteria** |
| **1. Topic justification** |
|  | **0-2** The article is a highly technical case study which is of no interest for the readers of the journal, or the article provides well-known solutions and introduces no new aspects |
|  | **3-4** The problem at issue is neither relevant, nor important for the development of the theoretical apparatus or understanding or current processes |
|  | **5-6** The problem at issue is actively discussed in scientific publications and the article presents author’s point of view |
|  | **7-8** The article deals with current economic issues, which are discussed in scientific publications  |
|  | **9-10** The article offers new solutions and modern approaches to the problem at issue, which is discussed in scientific publications |
| **2. Clearly reported original hypothesis which is being proved in the article** |
|  | **0-3** There is no clear hypothesis**4-6** There is author’s hypothesis, which, however, has analogues in other published articles, or the hypothesis is not clearly defined and cannot be proved or disproved**7-8** The author has identified the problem at issue, pointing at its unresolved and ambiguous aspects and providing possible solutions. However, the hypothesis is can neither be unequivocally proved nor disproved |
|  | **9-10** The article provides a clear hypothesis which requires a proof. There exists necessary theoretical apparatus to prove or disprove original hypothesis |
| **3. Level of the topic scientific development** |
|  | **0-3** Sporadic and formal review**4-6** The article considers mainstream research works, provides ready-made solutions**7-8** The article reviews key research works, identifies currently discussed issues**9-10** The article provides a detailed review of the problem at issue, identifies unresolved aspects |
| **4. Theoretical and applied methods used by the author** |
|  | **0-3** The article lacks formal logic, there is no clear evidence base**4-6** The article is logical and provides statistic evidence and calculations **7-8** The article employs formal apparatus which allows to prove or disprove author’s hypothesis**9-10** The article provides clear logical and/or formalized (in the form of econometric model) scheme of proof of the introduced propositions  |
| **5. Interpretation of obtained results** |
|  | **0-3** Findings are not directly connected with the problem at issue**4-6** There are well-founded conclusions, which, however, do not clearly prove or disprove author’s hypothesis**7-8** There are well-founded conclusions which provide for the solution of the problem at issue**9-10** Findings have independent scientific significance |
| **6. Reviewer’s opinion** (based both on the total score of \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ and non-quantitative arguments) – please, mark “**√**” for appropriate option. |
|  | The article is recommended for publication (**41-50 points**)The article is recommended for publication, with comments and recommendations of the reviewers being taken into account at the discretion of the author (**31-40 points**)The article is recommended for publication only after introducing changes in accordance with comments and recommendations of reviewers (**21-30 points**)The article is rejected with an opportunity to resubmit (**15-20 points**)The article is rejected with no opportunity to resubmit (**less 15 points**) |
| **General opinion** (*identification of strengths and (or) weaknesses of the article*), *obligatory for filling out* |
| **Recommendations for the author** (*the section is obligatory, should the article be rejected or recommended for publication after introducing changes in accordance with comments made by reviewer*) |
| **Additional comments for the editorial board** |

**Reviewer (*name, academic degree, position, place of employment, e-mail, signature*) [[1]](#footnote-1):**
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