| EVALUATION FORM OF ARTICLE: |
|---|
| from the table of contents Scientific Bulletin no / |
| |

- 1. Date of evaluation:
- 2. Reviewer's name:
- 3. Evaluation criteria:

| Primary criteria * | Yes | No |
|---------------------------------------|-----|----|
| Compliance with editorial standards | | |
| 2. Existence of abstract and keywords | | |
| 3. Correctness of citations | | |
| 4. Accuracy of the English language | | |
| 5. Plagiarism percentage: max 20% | 0 | % |

^{*} Evaluated by the Scientific Research Section specialiste.

| Scores | | | Yes | | | No |
|--|---|---|-----|---|---|----|
| Evaluation Criteria | 5 | 4 | ფ | 2 | 1 | |
| 1. Relevance of the abstract | | | | | | |
| 2. Scientific argumentation | | | | | | |
| 3. Presentation of some analysis methods | | | | | | |
| 4. The accuracy of using the investigation instruments | | | | | | |
| 5. Novelty of the topic | | | | | | |
| 6. The originality of solving the addressed problem | | | | | | |
| 7. The topicality and the utility of the suggested | | | | | | |
| solution | | | | | | |
| 8.Clarity of conclusions and further research directions | | | | | | |
| 9. Relevance of bibliographic sources | | | | | | |
| TOTAL** | | | | | | |

^{**} Minimum 25 points for the acceptance of paper.

4. Recommendations of scientific reviewers

| Recommendations | Yes | No |
|--|-----|----|
| Will be published in the form received | | |
| Requires utterance changes | | |
| Requires content changes | | |
| Article rejected | | |

5. Additional Comments

| Date of evaluation: | Signature |
|---------------------|-----------|
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |