Review on the article submitted for publication in "Socio-Cultural Management Journal"

Author code	
Article title	
Date of receipt	

Evaluation elements	Reviewer conclusion ("yes", "not completely", "no")	Reviewer comments (If "yes", do not comment)
Compliance with the journal profile article		
Clarity and informativeness of the article title		
Abstract quality (completeness and conciseness of the article content)		
Correct keywords selection		
1. Introduction		
Scientific problem clarity		
Completeness and depth of problem study analysis		
Determination thoroughness of unresolved issues in the researched problem		
2. Purpose and methods		
Research purpose and objectives clarity		
Methodology and research methods validity		
Reliability of theoretical and empirical information base of the research		
3. Results and discussion		
Correctness of subsections' headings		
Reliability and validity of the obtained results		
Analysis and discussion of the obtained results		
4. Conclusions		
Conclusions validity		
Scientific novelty of research results		
Theoretical and practical significance of the study		
Prospects for further research in this direction		
Academicity of material presentation style:		
Logic, clarity, conciseness		
Scientific terminology accuracy		
Source information reliability		
Facts' selection criticality		
Text content proof		
Completeness (integrity of individual issues disclosure)		
Considerations and discussions presence		
Conclusions validity		
Credibility of the used literature on the researched topic		
The article contains only those sources that were actually used in the study		
Correct citation and references to sources		
Relevance of figures, tables and their design correctness		
Correct spelling and grammar		

Compliance with the article title, its purpose, objectives, sections content, conclusions and abstracts		
Author misconduct		
Plagiarism		
Citations manipulation		
Data falsification		
Re-submission		

Additional comments and suggestions (if necessary):

General conclusion

The reviewer chooses one of the solutions:

1) the article is recommended for publication;
2) the article can be published, but after the author corrects the reviewer's comments
    (with or without re-review);
3) the article is not recommended for publication.

Reviewer

Reviewer Code:
Review Date:

Corresponding Editor   **Name and surname**
Email: biguss@meta.ua