Form of review of articles submitted to the editorial board of the scientific journal "Vita Antiqua"

Title of the peer-reviewed article

1. Yes	Does the title of the article No	e correspond to its content? Need revision
2. Yes	Does the article contain so	cientific novelty / value? Need revision
3. Yes	Is the author's scientific sty No	vle, logic and clarity of presentation? Need revision
4. Yes	Are the research methods	relevant to the problem? Need revision
5. Yes	Did the author adhere to t No	he standards of academic integrity? Need revision
6. Yes	Is it appropriate to cite the	e works of other authors? Need revision
7. Yes	Does the abstract meet th	e requirements of the article? Need revision
8. Yes	The arguments, reasoning convincing?	and conclusions of the author are Need revision
9.	Assess the literacy of writ elements (abstracts and	ing / translating articles or English references):
No n	eed for editing.	
A slig	nht adjustment is required.	
Subst	tantial proofreading is requ	Jired.

Automatic translation.

10. Does the quality of the illustrative material meet the standards? Yes No Need revision 11. Opinion of the reviewer 1. The article meets all requirements and can be recommended for printing. 2. The article has minor flaws (punctuation, spelling errors) and may be recommended for printing after being eliminated by the author. 3. The article contains significant shortcomings, in particular it does not contain scientific novelty or practical and theoretical value, so it cannot be recommended for publication. 4. It is established that the author violated the principles of academic integrity (plagiarism, self-plagiarism) and copyright, so the article is not recommended for publication. Recommendations for the author (please note if you have chosen the 2nd or 3rd variant of conclusion):

Date:	The reviewer signature