

REVIEW OF SCIENTIFIC ARTICLE

Sent to the editor of the Electronic Scientific journal «Service plus»
<http://philosoph.ru> 141221, Moscow Region, Pushkinskiy District, Urban-Type Settlement of Cherkizovo, Glavnaya Str., 99 (office 1217)
Telephone number: 8 (495) 940-83-63 int.395
E-mail of editorial board: redkollegiamgus@mail.ru
E-mail of editor-in-chief: kortunov@live.com

REVIEW OF SCIENTIFIC ARTICLE

1. Registration number of the article _____ (Filled by the editor)
2. Title of the article _____
3. The journal issue for which the article is presented _____ (Filled by the editor)
4. Author's institution _____
5. Date of review: Date of sending Date of sending the re-
 for reviewing view to the editorial board _____
6. Plagiarism percentage (can be filled by the editor), % _____

Scientific and methodological assessment of the article by the reviewer

Questions for the reviewer		Answers		
		YES	NO	
1.	Does the subject of the article correspond to the scientific (scientific and practical) profile and to the topic of the journal issue?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
2.	Is the topic of the article relevant and practically useful in current conditions?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
3.	Does the title of the article present its object, subject, purpose and content?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
4.	Is the abstract of the article well written in accordance with the requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
5.	Is the article list of keywords sufficient and adequate?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
6.	Does the introduction formulate the article methodological constituents and do they correspond to the content of the article?	object of the research	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7.		subject of the research	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8.		purpose of the research	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9.		statement of the problem	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10.	Does the article have the analysis of the predecessors' works on the subject of the article?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
11.	Is the urgency of the article sufficiently proved?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

12.	Does the article have scientific and/or practical innovation? Does it have its own empirical study?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
-----	---	--------------------------	--------------------------

REVIEW OF SCIENTIFIC ARTICLE

General conclusion of the reviewer:

Article for publication in electronic scientific journal
«Service plus»

- recommended not recommended
 without changes
 with minor revision
 with substantial revision according to reviewer's comments

Reviewing	needed	not needed
second reviewing	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
alternative reviewing	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

REVIEWER:

(Data are not reported to the authors)

Name, degree, academic status,
honorary title, position and work-
place

Signature

Date