The Title of the article:
The author(s) of the article:
The Reviewer (last name, first name, patronymic, PhD, affiliation, position, e-mail, telephone number):

General impression: excellent   above average   average   unsatisfactory

Reviewer's recommendation: accept in principle
                                  accept after correction
                                  reject

Article assessment:
Does the title comply with the content? yes   no   not completely
Does the size of the article comply with its content?   yes   abridge   expand
Topicality: urgently topical   highly topical   rather topical   not topical
Validity: high   acceptable   with mistakes
Scientific novelty: primary   high   average   zero
Practical significance: primary   high   average   zero
The choice of key words: acceptable   redundant   insufficient   with mistakes
Does the abstract comply with the content of the article? yes   no   redundant   insufficient
Does the bibliography comply with the content of the article: yes   no   redundant   insufficient
Validity of references: high   average   low
Assessment of the practical part: excellent   average   unsatisfactory
Assessment of the theoretical part: excellent   average   unsatisfactory
Images quality: high   average   low
Table quality: high   average   low
Do the goals comply with the topic: yes   partially   no
Are conclusions probative? yes   partially   no
Does the article comply with the standards and requirements of the Bulletin? yes no
Scientific style: good acceptable bad

For little articles and short reports the questionnaire can be shortened.

Reviewer's comments:
Enclosed pages: no   one   two   three

Reviewer's signature: **Date**