MANUSCRIPT REVIEW CARD
(Review article)

For review article _____

_____

1.	Does the review address a specific aspect	**yes**	**no**
2.	Is the review systematic or meta-analysis review?	**yes**	**no**
3.	Does the review have the character of a discussion?	**yes**	**no**
4.	Does the review address current issues of etiology, and/or pathogenesis, and/or diagnosis, and/or treatment, and/or prevention of various pathologies?	**yes**	**no**
5.	Does the review reflect clear criteria for finding and using literature?	**yes**	**no**
6.	Are there enough references to significant publications on the topic of work over the past 10 years?	**yes**	**no**
7.	Does the review have scientific and/or practical value?	**yes**	**no**
8.	Does the review end with a hypothesis and, thereby, stimulate scientists to study any aspect in the future?	**yes**	**no**
9.	Are the authors specialists in the field of the problem considered in the review	**yes**	**no**
10.	Does the review end with evidence-based or statistically established findings?	**yes**	**no**
11.	Does the summary reflect the main provisions of the work adequately?	**yes**	**no**
12.	Is the review written correctly, in good language?	**yes**	**no**
OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF THE WORK (set points)			

Notes:

Each answer "yes" – 1 point, each answer "no" – 0 point.
In the line "overall assessment *of the work*" you need to set the amount of points.
With a total score of 4 or less – "reject",
with a total score of 5-8 points – "the work requires improvement»,
with a total score of 9-12 points – «publish».

In case of questions and comments on the work (marked "no" in the table), please give a detailed commentary on each comment and specific proposals for its solution (of course, if this solution exist).

Reviewer _____
<div align="center">Full name, signature</div>