**PEER REVIEW FORM**

**Title:**

---

**Reviewer:**

1. The article corresponds to the profile of “Art Readings”:

fully | partially | no

2. The article is dedicated to a significant scientific problem:

fully | partially | no

3. The author is well acquainted with the current state of the respective scientific field and the relevant literature:

fully | satisfactorily | poorly

4. The article has a contribution to the field:

fully | partially | no

5. The article contributes to (more than one answer is possible):

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| theoretical framework of the examined issues | with new interpretations and data in the respective scientific field | presents new field research material |

6. The article contains clearly formulated goals, author positions, and conclusions:

fully | satisfactorily | poorly

7. The exposition is logical and features a convincing argumentation of the defended theses:

fully | satisfactorily | слабо

8. The article is at a good stylistic and linguistic level:

fully | satisfactorily | poorly

9. The footnotes and referenced literature meet the requirements of the publication:

fully | satisfactorily | poorly

10. The abstract and keywords accurately and fully reflect the content of the article:

yes | partially | no

11. The illustrative material meets the requirements of the publication:

| yes | partially | no |
|---|---|---|

12. Comments and recommendations to the author:

13. Your recommendation to the editorial board:

| to publish the article without changes | to publish the article after revision by the author | not to publish the article |
|---|---|---|

**DATE:**