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Dear Reviewer,

Thank you for agreeing to evaluate the manuscript of a scientific article proposed for publication. Please describe it according to the criteria below, formulate a conclusion concerning the appropriateness of its publication and provide detailed informative comments for authors and editors.

We ask you to pay special attention to the section "Comments for the author(s)." We expect that your expert evaluation will help the JLE Editorial Board to make the right decision regarding the publication, and also, what is equally important, will allow the author to improve the quality of the manuscript, to compensate for the gaps in the structure and logic of argumentation. Reviewers are required to draw attention to the lack of references to relevant works in the manuscript being evaluated.

We would be grateful if these comments will be about one page of text (1600 – 1800 characters).
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| Title of the article: |

**Responses:**

Please decide if each of the following parts of the paper has been presented adequately:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | **Yes** | **Partly** | **No** | **See comments** |
| 1 | Does the title of the paper clearly reflect its contents? |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | Is the abstract sufficiently informative? |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | Does the introduction set out the argument? |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | Does the introduction summarize recent research related to the topic? |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | Does the introduction highlight gaps in current understanding or conflicts in current knowledge? |  |  |  |  |
| 6 | Does the introduction establish the originality of the research aims by demonstrating the need for investigations in the topic area? |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | Does the introduction state the research aim or raise the research questions? |  |  |  |  |
| 8 | Is the research methodology clear? |  |  |  |  |
| 9 | Are the results and discussion logically derived from the theoretical/experimental work? |  |  |  |  |
| 10 | Are the results presented clearly and accurately? |  |  |  |  |
| 11 | Do the results presented match the methods? |  |  |  |  |
| 12 | Has the appropriate statistical treatment been applied to the results? |  |  |  |  |
| 13 | Is the data described in the text consistent with the data in the figures and tables? |  |  |  |  |
| 14 | Are figures, tables and pictures appropriate?  |  |  |  |  |
| 15 | Do figures, tables and pictures properly show the data? |  |  |  |  |
| 16 | Does the text contain references to all tables and figures? |  |  |  |  |
| 17 | Are there any key references missing?  |  |  |  |  |
| 18 | Are bibliography presented in accordance with the requirements? |  |  |  |  |
| 19 | Are newly published sources included into reference list? |  |  |  |  |
| 20 | Are the conclusions clear and logical? |  |  |  |  |
| 21 | Is the article in line with the aims and scope of the journal? |  |  |  |  |
| 23 | Does the English language require improvement? |  |  |  |  |

Recommendations for the acceptance of the paper (please underline one choice only):

* accept without corrections;
* accept with minor corrections (repeated reviewing not required);
* accept with corrections;
* accept only after substantial corrections;
* don’t accept (explanation available in comments).
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