**Guidelines for review writing**

*Dear reviewers!*

Thank you for your contribution to the quality of scientific publications of the journal “Bulletin of L.N. Gumilyov ENU. Philology Series”. Below are the main recommendations and the structure of the review to evaluate the submitted materials.

**The review aims to:**

**-** Evaluate the originality and research novelty of the article.

- Check the compliance of the content with the aims and scope of the journal.

- Give recommendations to improve the quality of the text.

- Make a decision on the publication.

**General requirements for the review**

1. Objectivity and impartiality. Analyze the article without regard to personal or professional preferences.

2. Confidentiality. Do not disseminate information about the content of the article or authors' data (if any).

3. Constructiveness. Comments should be clear and contain specific suggestions for improvement.

**Evaluation Criteria**

All research articles shall be evaluated according to the following three criteria on a 100-point scale:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Very low****(0-20 points)** | **Low****(21-40 points)** | **Medium****(41-60 points)** | **High****(61-80 points)** | **Very high****(81-100 points)** |
| a) Relevance of the research |  |  |  |  |  |
| b) Level of results obtained - contribution to the research field |  |  |  |  |  |
| c) Readability of the manuscript, readability for non-specialists |  |  |  |  |  |

**In reviewing papers, finding answers to the following questions will help you:**

- How relevant is the problem posed by the author?

- Does the article sufficiently reveal a new scientific problem or develop an existing one?

- Does the article correspond to the subject of the journal?

- Structure and content of the article. Is the material logically and consistently presented?

- Does the content correspond to the stated goal and objectives of the research?

- Do the sections of the article (introduction, methodology, results and discussion, conclusion) conform to scientific standards.

- How correct and justified are the research methods?

- Are there borrowings in the paper without reference to the source (plagiarism)?

- Does the work conform to the scientific style?

- Accuracy of wording and absence of ambiguity.

- Presence of grammatical or stylistic errors.

- Are there specific flaws or weaknesses in the paper?

Indicate what changes should be made to improve the text.

Give suggestions for revision of the article (if necessary).

Inform the editorial board if you are unable to evaluate the article due to a conflict of interest.

If the article is beyond your expertise, decline to review.

**PAT ATTENTION!!!**

- All reviews are submitted **anonymously**.

- The reviewer should not provide personal information in any way.

Thank you for your cooperation and your contribution to the development of science!

See the review template on the next page...

**REVIEW**

**Manuscript No. \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ (registration number)**

**titled:**

**\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**1. Description of the research problem in the manuscript:**

|  |
| --- |
|  *Fill in the text here…* |

**2. Analysis of the manuscript, including the degree of relevance of the researched problem, comparisons with similar studies, research methods, results, as well as the most important aspects disclosed by the author in the manuscript** (use as much space as necessary):

|  |
| --- |
|  *Fill in the text here…* |

**3. Assessment**

Based on the above (score on a 100-point scale):

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Very low****(0-20 points)** | **Low****(21-40 points)** | **Medium****(41-60 points)** | **High****(61-80 points)** | **Very high****(81-100 points)** |
| a) Relevance of the research |  |  |  |  |  |
| b) Level of results obtained - contribution to the research field |  |  |  |  |  |
| c) Readability of the manuscript, readability for non-specialists |  |  |  |  |  |

**4. Conclusion**

|  |
| --- |
| *Fill in the text here…* |

**5. Recommendation**

Choose one:

[ ]  Accept submission

☐ Revisions required

☐ Resubmit for review

☐ Resubmit elsewhere

☐ Decline submission

Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_\_ 20 \_\_\_.

☐ I confirm that this review does not contain my personal data and that the review is submitted anonymously.