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**Relevance to the subject area**

**Justification**

**Novelty**

**Ethics**

**Evaluation of manuscript elements**

Does the **Title** correspond to the content of the manuscript?

**Abstract** (structured, is the description of aims, methods, results, and significance presented)?

**Introduction**

Is the research aim clearly defined and is its scope clearly defined? Does the author justify the relevance and significance of the research based on the literature review? Does the author provide definitions of the terms that appear in the manuscript?

**Literature review**

**Methods**

**Results**

**Discussion**

**Conclusions**

Does the list of **References** conform to the journal’s format? Are there important works that are not mentioned but should be noted? Are the cited references relevant?

**Tables**

**Figures**

**Disclosure of information about conflicts of interest**

**Comments**

**REVIEWER'S DECISION**

The article meets the requirements for works of this kind and can be **accepted for publication** in the peer-reviewed scientific and theoretical journal “Tambov University Review. Series: Humanities”.

The article meets the requirements for works of this kind and can be **accepted for publication after minor revisions** in the peer-reviewed scientific and theoretical journal “Tambov University Review. Series: Humanities”.

The article may be **accepted for publication** in the peer-reviewed scientific and theoretical journal “Tambov University Review. Series: Humanities” taking into account the comments made **after significant revision and review of the article**.

In its current form, the article does not meet the necessary requirements and cannot be recommended for publication in the peer-reviewed scientific and theoretical journal “Tambov University Review. Series: Humanities”. **Reject.**

In its current form, the article does not meet the necessary requirements and cannot be recommended for publication in the peer-reviewed scientific and theoretical journal “Tambov University Review. Series: Humanities”. **Reject and suggest the author resubmit the article for review.**

The reviewer agrees to the transfer of the review text to RSCI /eLibrary.
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**RECOMMENDATIONS FOR REVIEWERS**

For the convenience of the reviewer, the Editorial Board of the journal “Tambov University Review. Series: Humanities” suggests using a quick review form – it reflects the questions to which the editor needs answers in order to make a decision about the article.

The Editorial Board of the journal requests that the reviewer give more attention to the “Comments” section to help the authors improve their current and future works.

**The content and structure of the review**

The Editorial Board of the journal “Tambov University Review. Series: Humanities” has received permission to use [NEICON’s methodological recommendations](https://elpub.ru/support/116-knowhow/517-metodicheskoe-posobie-retsenzirovanie) in the journal’s peer review policy.

10 criteria by which the manuscript should be evaluated:

1. Originality;
2. Logical rigor;
3. Statistical rigor;
4. Clarity and conciseness of writing style;
5. Theoretical significance;
6. Reliable results;
7. Relevance to contemporary fields of research;
8. Reproducibility of results;
9. Coverage of the literature;
10. Application of results.

In addition to the quick review form, the Editorial Board of the journal “Tambov University Review. Series: Humanities” recommends that reviewers adhere to the following review structure (download the review template).

**Comments for the editor**

Conflict of interest – is a real or potential conflict of interest related to the content of the manuscript or its authors, which may lead to biased conclusions, is described.

Confidential comments – this section is intended for comments that will not be forwarded to the authors. It includes the reviewer’s final conclusion on the fate of the manuscript, the reviewer’s assumptions, expressions of doubts regarding possible ethical violations, as well as recommendations and accompanying comments (for example, the reviewer may advise the editor to request additional information from the author). The proposed decision is usually a brief conclusion about the fate of the manuscript.

**Comments for the authors**

Introduction – in this section, the main conclusions and the value of the article for readers are described. Main comments – in this section, the relevance to the journal’s goals and objectives, the level of reliability, and ethical conduct are described.Special comments – the reviewer evaluates sections of the article (abstract, introduction, methods, results, discussion) or provides comments on specific pages, paragraphs, or lines.

Recommendations to the author – the reviewer provides recommendations to the author to improve the quality of the manuscript and possibly future research.

Final comment – a brief description of the strengths and weaknesses of the manuscript without any additional recommendations.

**CRITERIA FOR MANUSCRIPT EVALUATION**

**Relevance to the subject area**

One should not waste time reviewing an irrelevant manuscript, regardless of its quality. It is necessary first of all to determine whether the manuscript corresponds to the subject area of the scientific journal and the interests of its audience.

**Justification**

Does the work meet all the necessary requirements in terms of research design, scientific methods, structure and content, as well as the depth of analysis, does it adhere to the principles of impartial scientific research, and are the research results reproducible?

**Novelty**

Has the conducted research brought something new to the relevant subject area?

**Ethics**

Has the conducted research brought something new to the relevant subject area?

Does the research meet the requirements of originality? Regardless of the perceived significance of the manuscript, it cannot be accepted for publication in cases of redundancy, plagiarism, or violation of the fundamental ethical principles of scientific research: legality, value, and respect for people.

**Evaluation of manuscript elements**

The Editorial Board of the journal “Tambov University Review. Series: Humanities” suggests using the following questions to expedite the process of preparing expert reviews and providing the most comprehensive information about the article to the editor and the author.

**Title**

Does the title accurately reflect the content of the manuscript? Will the title attract the readers’ attention?

**Abstract**

Is the content of the manuscript properly presented in the abstract (is the abstract structured, with a description of the aim, methods, results, and significance)?

Are there any discrepancies between the abstract and the sections of the manuscript? Is it possible to understand the abstract without reading the manuscript?

**Introduction**

Is the introduction brief? Are the research aim clearly defined and the scope of work set? Does the author justify the relevance and significance of the research based on a literature review? Does the author provide definitions of the terms that appear in the manuscript?

**Literature review**

How comprehensive is the literature review?

**Methods**

Will another researcher be able to reproduce the study’s results using the proposed methods, or are the methods unclear?

Do the authors justify their choice when describing the research methods?

How is the research design presented?

How does data analysis help in achieving the set goal?

**Results**

Are the results clearly explained? Does the order of presenting the results match the order of describing the methods? Are the results justified and expected or unexpected? Are there results that are not preceded by a corresponding description in the “Methods” section? How accurate is the presentation of the results?

**Discussion**

Is the discussion brief? If not, how can it be shortened?

Do the authors’ conclusions align with the results obtained during the study? If unexpected results are obtained, do the authors properly analyze them? What potential contribution does the research make to the industry and to global science?

**Conclusions**

Do the authors note the limitations of the study? Are there any additional limitations that should be noted? What is the authors’ opinion on these limitations? What is the authors’ opinion on the direction of future research?

**References**

Does the list of references conform to the journal’s format? Are there bibliographic errors in the reference list? Are the references to the articles in the bibliography within the text of the article correct? Are there important works that are not mentioned but should be noted? Are there more references in the article than necessary? Are the cited references relevant?

**Tables**

If there are tables in the article, do they accurately describe the results? Should one or more tables be added to the article? Is the data presented in the tables appropriately processed and facilitates the perception of information rather than complicating it?

**Figures**

Are tables and figures an appropriate choice for solving the given task? Is it possible to illustrate the results in another way? Do the figures and graphs accurately show the important results? Should changes be made to the figures and graphs for a more accurate and clear representation of the results? Do the captions for the figures and graphs allow the information to be understood without referring to the manuscript itself?

**Disclosure of information about conflicts of interest**

Is the information about funding and conflict of interest clearly stated?

**CONDITIONS FOR ACCEPTANCE OR REJECTION OF A MANUSCRIPT FOR PUBLICATION**

The Editorial Board of the journal “Tambov University Review. Series: Humanities” suggests using the following justification for the reviewer’s final decision.

**Accept the article for publication**

The reviewer understands that the article is ready for publication in its current form. The article is well-founded, ethical, significant for the scientific community, and complements already published works; the writing style is clear and concise.

**Accept after minor revisions**

There are non-critical comments on the article that need to be addressed. This could be poor article style, lack of clarity in presentation, insufficiently developed article structure, errors in references, duplication of information in figures and tables, and in the article text. After making changes and re-evaluating, the article may be accepted for publication.

**Accept after significant revision and review of the article**

The article has serious shortcomings and errors that affect the reliability of the obtained results: issues with ethics, research design, gaps in the description of research methods, poorly presented results or their incorrect interpretation, insufficiently complete description of the limitations of the conducted research, contradictory (or self-refuting) conclusions, lack of references to important studies, unclear tables and figures that require significant revision. After re-evaluation, the article may be accepted, rejected, or sent for additional review. Such a decision often requires the collection of additional data from the author. **Reject**

The work does not meet the journal’s aims and scope, has one or more irreparable flaws, or serious ethical issues. The reviewer should provide detailed comments justifying their decision, as they can help the author significantly improve the work.

**Reject and suggest the author resubmit the article for review**

The topic or subject matter is interesting, but the author uses incorrect or insufficiently reliable methods, therefore the obtained data is also not reliable. Such a decision is also possible in cases where the article requires numerous changes or when it is not possible to obtain the requested additional information from the author. Authors are invited to conduct the research again, taking into account the recommended changes, and submit the new results for review.

**Editing reviews**

The Editorial Board of the journal “Tambov University Review. Series: Humanities” expects that reviews [will be written in a friendly tone](https://publicationethics.org/resources/guidelines/editing-peer-reviews) and in accordance with the rules of the Russian language. Personal attacks, insults towards the author, and unfounded criticism of any aspect of the research, language, and style of the manuscript, etc., are prohibited.

The Editorial Board of the journal “Tambov University Review. Series: Humanities” strives to convey reviews to authors in their original form; however, in some cases, it may be necessary to modify the text of the review without losing its meaning (for example, when consolidating comments from several experts on a single issue or in the presence of confidential comments in the section of the review intended for the author).

The Editorial Board of the journal “Tambov University Review. Series: Humanities” reserves the right to send a review back to the expert for revision in case of a large number of errors or an unacceptable tone in the review.