**The integral assessment of the scientific component of the article**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Article ID:** |  |
| **Title:** |  |
| **Type of article** (original research/ review article– underline) |  |
| **Scientific Editor:**  | Scientific editor Full name, title, position, place of work, contacts |

**1.** **Evaluation of the level of scientific significance and relevance of the topic of the article:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Breakthrough topic, research can create preconditions for the formation of new scientific directions | [ ]  5 points |
| Promising topic, research is relevant in terms of the dynamic development of the existing scientific direction | [ ]  4 points |
| Сurrently popular topic | [ ]  3 points |
| Routine topic, research is relevant to clarify existing scientific results | [ ]  2 points |
| The scientific significance and relevance of the topic is doubtful or not obvious | [ ]  1 point |

**2. Evaluation of the degree of scientific novelty of research:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| The study contains fundamentally new methods and approaches for solving the chosen tasks, which have no analogues in the world | [ ]  5 points |
| The study contains new methods and approaches for solving the chosen tasks, corresponding to advanced developments in this field of research | [ ]  4 points |
| The study contains new methods and approaches for solving the chosen tasks, corresponding to analogs in this field of research | [ ]  3 points |
| The study contains methods and approaches for solving the chosen tasks, to a large extent repeating the existing analogues in this field of research | [ ]  2 points |
| The study does not contain any new methods and approaches for solving the chosen tasks | [ ]  1 point |

**3. Evaluation of the author's possession of information on the current state of research on the topic of the article:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Comprehensive knowledge of relevant information about the main world scientific competitors, current state of research in the field, trends and problems in the development of the topic | [ ]  5 points |
| Up-to-date knowledge of the main world scientific competitors and the current state of research in the field as a whole, but there is no analysis of the relevant information | [ ]  4 points |
| Fragmentary knowledge of the main world scientific competitors and the state of research in the field | [ ]  3 points |
| Outdated information about the main world scientific competitors and the state of research in the direction | [ ]  2 points |
| Lack of knowledge of the main world scientific competitors and the state of research on the subject of the study or the lack of information in the article for evaluation | [ ]  1 point |

**4.** **Evaluation of the proposed methods and approaches for solving the tasks of the study:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| The methods and approaches used allow successfully solving the chosen tasks | [ ]  5 points |
| In general, the methods and approaches used are adequate to the chosen tasks | [ ]  4 points |
| Outdated or partially outdated methods and approaches are used | [ ]  3 points |
| Methods and approaches used do not correspond to the chosen tasks | [ ]  2 points |
| The methods and approaches used do not allow solving the chosen tasks | [ ]  1 point |

**5. Evaluation of the compliance of the proposed results with the world-level of research:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| The results of the research can significantly affect the modern global science, change current knowledge of the nature, structure and patterns of phenomena and objects | [ ]  5 points |
| Fundamentally new results of high significance for global science | [ ]  4 points |
| Competitive results with limited relevance for global science | [ ]  3 points |
| The significance of results for global science is not obvious at this stage, there is not enough information for evaluation. Additional justification is recommended | [ ]  2 points |
| Obviously, the results will not be in demand by global science | [ ]  1 point |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Sum of points:** |  |
| **Integrated score** **(**Sum of points /5): |  |

**Scientific Editor's decision:**

[ ]  **reject** — the scientific level of the article does not meet the requirements of the Editorial Board.

The decision is made if the integrated score is 1.0–3.5 points

[ ]  **accept INTO WORK** — the scientific level of the article meets the requirements of the Editorial Board.

The decision is made if the integrated score is 3.5-5 points

**Recommendations to Editorial Board:** .......................................................................................

**Recommend two reviewers who have publications on the subject of the article in the last 3 years - if possible: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**