

THE REVIEW

of the article subjected for publication in
**the Materials and studies on archaeology of Sub-Carpathian and Volhynian
 area.**

1	Article's title	Article's Title
2	Article's size	The number of pages, figures, tables, sources
3	Article's devoted	Describe the topic of the article
4	Article's topicality	<i>Estimation of the level of substantiation of the article's topicality as</i> High Satisfactory Low
5	Conformity to the profile of the edition	Article conforms to the edition's profile Article does not conform to the edition's profile
6	Scientific novelty	<i>Estimation of article's scientific novelty level as</i> High Satisfactory Low
7	Research's objective and concept	<i>Estimation of the level of the substantiation of the article's purpose and its concept as</i> High Satisfactory Low
8	Scientific value	<i>Evaluate of the level of scientific value of the reviewed article</i> High Satisfactory Low
9	Article's structure	Article is structured according to the established requirements Article structure does not meet the established requirements
10	The basic results of the researches (generalisation of historiographic and source base, results definition, theoretical and practical importance, correctness of the use of the conceptual-categorical terms, conclusion:	<i>Estimation of the completeness of generalisation of the historiographic and source base, statement of results, theoretical and practical importance, correctness of the use of the notional-categoric apparatus, and formulation of conclusions</i>

11	Use of literary sources	<i>Evaluate the completeness of the review and its relevance to the current state of the scientific problem. Correspondence of the content of the text of the article</i> High Satisfactory Low
12	Linguo-stylistic level	<i>Estimation of the stylistic and grammatical quality of the reviewed material as</i> High Satisfactory Low
13	Arrangement quality	<i>Estimation of the quality of arrangement of the material as</i> High Satisfactory Low
14	The reader's recommendations	It is recommended for publication It is recommended for publication after re-elaboration It is not recommended for publication due to ... Recommendations
15	The additional comment of the reviewer	
16	Information about the reviewer / reader	Surname, first and patronymic names Scientific degree Academic status Work place Email address

The article has been received by the reader on _____ 2019

The review has been written on _____ 2019

Surname, first name, patronymic name, the reader's signature.