

Scientific Journal Review Form

for manuscript submitted for International Scientific Journal "Mechanism of Economic Regulation"

Dear Reviewer,

You can help the author by suggesting specific improvements, by returning the review form and manuscript with detailed comments and corrections. You can help the editor by commenting on the technical significance and accuracy of the work. Your comments will assist the associate editor in determining the final disposition of the manuscript, and will be used to assist the author in refinement of the manuscript.

Review form is available on the journal [website](#) and may be completed and sent to the Editorial Board in electronic form. All your comments will be forwarded to the author while **reviewing is a double-blind process**. If you are not able to referee the enclosed manuscript, please return the form and the manuscript to the Journal editor. Or let us know do you know of others who would be competent to review this paper? If so, please provide names and contact information (e-mail preferred).

Please, mark by «X» fields proper to your opinion.

Date of sending this form: ____/____/____

Date for returning this form: ____/____/____

Paper Author: *{information is unavailable due to the double-blind reviewing policy}*

Paper Title: _____

1. Is the topic appropriate for publication in this journal?

☐ Yes

☐ Perhaps

☐ No

2. Is the paper scientifically sound?

☐ Yes

☐ No

3. Evaluate the extent of the manuscript topic, achieve declared goals and tasks of research

☐ Very good

☐ Good (treatment somewhat unbalanced, but not seriously so)

☐ Satisfactory (some aspects of paid too much or too little attention)

☐ Poor (important information is missing or superficially treated)

4. How would you describe the scientific depth of the paper?

☐ Superficial

☐ Suitable for the non-specialist

☐ Appropriate for the generally knowledgeable individual working in the field

☐ Suitable only for an expert

5. How would you rate the overall organization of the paper?

☐ Satisfactory

☐ Could be improved

☐ Poor

6. Are the abstract satisfactory?

☐ Yes

☐ Could be improved

☐ No

7. Are symbols, terms, and concepts adequately defined?

☐ Yes

☐ Not always

☐ No

8. How would you rate the novelty of the paper?

☐ Highly novel ☐ Sufficiently novel ☐ Slightly novel ☐ Not novel

9. Is the volume of the paper submitted to the editorial office reasonable (it is determined in case of non-compliance of paper to the volume of material recommended in Guide Line)?

- ☐ Yes, the volume of submitted paper is acceptable, taking into account the topic, scientific novelty and pithiness
- ☐ No, the volume of submitted paper should be cut (material contains a significant amount of purely descriptive or well-known facts that is not scientifically interesting; for more details – see §11 of these Review Form)
- ☐ No, the volume of submitted paper is inadequate and it should be extended and modified (paper does not contain the essential aspects of the research on this issue, for more details – see §11 of these Review Form)

10. How would you rate orthographic and grammatical style of the represented material?

☐ Totally accessible ☐ Mostly accessible ☐ Partially accessible ☐ Inaccessible

11. Detailed comments (if necessary). Feel free to attach extra sheets of comments and to make notes on the manuscript.

☐ No comments ☐ See attached comments ☐ See comments on manuscript

12. Recommendation:

- ☐ Publish as is
- ☐ Publish in minor, required changes (as noted in Section 11)
- ☐ Review again after major changes (as noted in Section 11)
- ☐ Reject (as noted in Section 11; Author(s) can resubmit rewritten paper)
- ☐ Reject (as noted in Section 11; Author(s) cannot resubmit this paper)

Reviewer contact Information

Reviewer's name: _____

Reviewer's contact information: _____

E-mail address: _____

Phone number: _____

*{information is unavailable due to the double-blind reviewing
policy}*

Reviewer's signature: _____

! The author's right to unpublished manuscripts !

The manuscript is a privileged document; the author retains the right to the unpublished work. A referee should not use the results or ideas obtained exclusively through the refereeing process in his/her research.

Please send this completed form (and possibly a copy of the manuscript) to

Dr., Prof. Leonid Melnyk
Department of Economics, Entrepreneurship and Business Administration
Sumy State University
Rymkogo-Korsakova St. 2,
Sumy, 40007, Ukraine
or via e-mail: mer@fem.sumdu.edu.ua, merjournal@gmail.com

11. Detailed comments (to be completed if necessary):

- 1.**
- 2.**
- 3.**
- 4.**
- 5.**
- 6.**
- 7.**
- 8.**
- 9.**
- 10.**