

LITERATURE REVIEW REVIEW FORM

CHECK LIST

Answer each item in the list (YES-indicates journal compliance; NO - does not comply with journal requirements). All inconsistencies with the journal requirements should be reflected in the review in the "Weaknesses of the article and what needs to be done to improve the article" section.

ABSTRACT

Is the abstract clear, accessible, and format-appropriate?*

The abstract should briefly state the main provisions and reflect the content of the article. It should be written clearly and succinctly, be unstructured, and fit into 1 paragraph.

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

The abstract does not exceed 300 words*

The summary should not exceed 300 words.

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

TITLE

Is the title of the article informative and relevant to the content?*

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

KEYWORDS

Are keywords relevant to the text?*

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

Do the keywords match MeSH (Medical Subject Headings)?*

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

REFERENCES

Articles in the list of references correspond to links in the text*

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

References include articles recently published (7-8 years)*

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

Are articles in the references formatted correctly?*

The list of references is drawn up according to the Vancouver style.

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

ARTICLE STRUCTURE

Does the structure of the article meet the requirements of the journal:

- **Introduction**
- **Main part**
- **Conclusion?***

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

INTRODUCTION

Is the topic and scope of the related literature being studied defined?*

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

Is the importance of writing this review explained?*

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

Is the scope of the review specified, i.e. what is included and what is not?*

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

Are there intentional exceptions?*

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

Is the organization (sequence) of the review explained?*

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

MAIN PART

Is the review organized chronologically or thematically or methodologically?*

Is each work critically summarized and evaluated in terms of background, methodology, and conclusions?*

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

Have inconsistencies, omissions and errors been addressed?*

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

CONCLUSION

Have important aspects of the existing body of literature been summarized?*

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

Is there an assessment of the current state, availability of the reviewed literature?*

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

Have significant shortcomings or gaps been identified in existing knowledge?*

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

Are there areas for future research?*

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

Is the article itself written consistently and logically?*

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

REVIEW

General statement or summary of the article and its results in your own words*

(a brief description of the problem, the relevance of the article, the most important aspects of the article)

Strengths of the article and what this study can add to what is already known in the field*

Weaknesses of the article and what needs to be done to improve the article

Given the questions from the checklist and your answers to them, give your recommendations

Key points in the article that need clarification, re-analysis, rewriting and additional information and your suggestions on what can be done to improve the article*

List and number the recommendations

Minor points, such as drawing tables not mentioned in the text, missing references, typos and other inconsistencies*

Перерахуйте за пунктами

NOTES TO THE EDITOR*

Confidential to the editor, including recommendations for publishing the article

DECISION*

Choose one (underline)

- Recommend the article for publication;
- Recommend the article for publication after revision taking into account the comments (minor changes);
- Recommend the article for publication after revision taking into account the comments (major changes);
- Do not recommend the article for publication.