**Memo to reviewer**

When evaluating an article and writing a review, the reviewer should follow these questions:

1. Relevance of the topic.
2. Originality of the study, novelty of the received data.
3. The completeness and accuracy of the presentation of the problem in the literature review.
4. Clarity of presentation of the goals and objectives of the work, their compliance with the presented factual material.
5. Completeness of the description of materials and methods.
6. Adequacy of the choice of research methods.
7. Adequacy of statistical analysis.
8. Relevance of the results to the stated objectives of the study.
9. Availability of an assessment of the obtained data.
10. Validity of conclusions.
11. The scientific significance of the results.
12. The practical value of the results.
13. Visibility of the presentation of data (the presence of tables, figures).
14. Comparison of obtained results with published data.
15. Availability of necessary references to all relevant publications on the topic of work.
16. The quality of the abstract and the correct choice of keywords.
17. Compliance with ethical standards.
18. The correctness of the reflection of results in conclusions, if any.

Recommendations on the fate of the article:

* accept submission
* minor revision
* major revision and review
* decline submission

Explanations

**To accept the paper in its present state**

The manuscript is ready for publication in its current submission, substantiated, ethical, significant for the scientific community, the writing style is clear and concise.

**To accept after a minor revision**

There are uncritical comments on the manuscript that need to be corrected.

This may be a bad style, lack of clarity of presentation, insufficiently developed structure, errors in links, duplication of information in figures and tables and in the text of the manuscript. After changes and reassessment, the manuscript can be accepted for publication.

**Major revision and subsequent review**

The article has serious flaws and errors that affect the reliability of the results: problems with ethics, research design, gaps in the description of research methods, poorly presented results or their misinterpretation, an insufficiently complete description of the limitations of the study, contradictory (or disproved by the author’s own statements) conclusions, lack of references to important studies, fuzzy tables and figures requiring serious revision.

After a subsequent review, the manuscript can be accepted, rejected or sent for additional review.

Time to review manuscript after revision - 2-3 weeks.

**To decline  the manuscript**

The work does not meet the scope and aims of the journal, has one or more irreparable defects or serious ethical problems: consent for publication was not obtained in cases where it is necessary, the research methods are unethical, the methodology is discredited or erroneous (for example, a process that seriously affects results).Review article require rejection if it does not contain a critical insight into the presented information for purpose of the solving scientific problems raised by authors.

The reviewer should give detailed comments, as they can help the author significantly improve the work.