

Scientific Journal Review Form

Dear Reviewer,

You can help the author by suggesting specific improvements, by returning the review form and manuscript with detailed comments and corrections. You can help the editor by commenting on the technical significance and accuracy of the work. Your comments will assist the associate editor in determining the final disposition of the manuscript, and will be used to assist the author in refinement of the manuscript.

All your comments will be forwarded to the author while you remain anonymous. If you are not able to referee the enclosed manuscript, please return the form and the manuscript to the Journal editor. Or let us know do you know of others who would be competent to review this paper? If so, please provide names and contact information (e-mail preferred).

Please, mark by «x» fields proper to your opinion.

Date of sending this form:	
Date for returning this form:	
Paper Author:	
Paper Title:	

1. Is the topic appropriate for publication in this journal?

☐ Yes ☐ Perhaps ☐ No

2. Is the paper scientifically sound?

☐ Yes ☐ No

3. Is the coverage of the topic sufficiently comprehensive and balanced?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ Important information is missing or superficially treated
- ☐ Treatment somewhat unbalanced, but not seriously so
- ☐ Certain parts significantly overstates

4. How would you describe the scientific depth of the paper?

- ☐ Superficial
- ☐ Suitable for the non-specialist
- ☐ Appropriate for the generally knowledgeable individual working in the field
- ☐ Suitable only for an expert

5. How would you rate the overall organization of the paper?

☐ Satisfactory ☐ Could be improved ☐ Poor

6. Are the abstract satisfactory?

☐ Yes ☐ No

7. Are symbols, terms, and concepts adequately defined?

☐ Yes ☐ Not always ☐ No

8. How would you rate accordance of material to the journal requirements

☐ Excellent ☐ Good ☐ Fair ☐ Poor

9. How would you rate the technical contents of the paper?

☐ Excellent ☐ Good ☐ Fair ☐ Poor

10. How would you rate the novelty of the paper?

☐ Highly novel ☐ Sufficiently novel ☐ Slightly novel ☐ Not novel

11. How would you rate orthographic and grammatical style of the represented material?

☐ Totally accessible ☐ Mostly accessible ☐ Partially accessible ☐ Inaccessible

12. Detailed comments. Feel free to attach extra sheets of comments and to make notes on the manuscript.

13. Recommendation.

- ☐ Publish as is
☐ Publish in minor, required changes (as noted in Section 14)
☐ Review again after major changes (as noted in Section 14)
☐ Reject (Paper is not of sufficient quality or novelty to be published in this transactions)
☐ Reject (A major rewrite is required. Author should be encouraged to resubmit rewritten paper)
☐ Reject (Paper is seriously flawed; do not encourage resubmission)

14. Do you consider this paper a candidate for an award for outstanding quality?

☐ Yes ☐ No

Reviewer's name:	
Reviewer's contact information:	
E-mail address:	
Phone number:	
Reviewer's signature:	

! The author's right to unpublished manuscripts !

The manuscript is a privileged document; the author retains the right to the unpublished work. A referee should not use the results or ideas obtained exclusively through the refereeing process in his/her research.

Please send this completed form (and possibly a copy of the manuscript) to

Dr., Prof. Leonid Melnyk
 Editorial Board of ISJ 'MER'
 Department of Economics
 Sumy State University
 R.-Korsakova St. 2,
 40007, Sumy,
 Ukraine

and via e-mail economier@mail.ru