
REVIEW FORM

Article's author _____

The title of the article _____

Dear Reviewer! We ask You to estimate the quality of the given article. Please, underline or make bold the needed point to the following statements:

1. The article matches the subject of "Chornomorski Botanical Journal"

- Yes Partially, specification is needed No

2. The article's title corresponds to its content

- Yes Partially, the title should be changed Does not correspond at all

3. The article highlights important and topical issues

- Very important Important Standard Importless and uninteresting

4. The main results of the research are completely disclosed in the article

- Yes There are some inaccuracies Partially, specification and amplification are needed No, materials should be reworked

5. The English version of annotation and titles is ...

- Great Good, but the correction is needed Sufficient, the accurate correction is needed Bad, it should be completely remade

6. The structure of the article complies with professional publications

- Yes Partially No

6. The presentation of the article's material is consistent, logical and clear

- Yes It's logical and consistent, but there are some unclear points It is hard to read, there are a lot of complex constructions It is very hard to understand the material

7. Author(s) adhere(s) to modern scientific terminology

- Yes Partially No

8. Latin names of species correspond to modern Checklists and nomenclature summaries:

– species of lichens and fungi – to «Index Fungorum» resource;

– species of higher plants – to monograph of Mosyakin S.L., Fedoronchuk M.M. «Vascular plants of Ukraine», 1999;

– species of mosses – to monograph of Boiko M.F. «Checklist of mosses of Ukraine», 2008.

- Yes Partially No

9. Lists of species of plants/algae/fungi/lichens are made in accordance to the requirements of the journal

- Yes Partially No

10. There are some errors in formulas, illustrations, schemes and its captions

- No There are some mistakes in captions There are some mistakes in graphical material and formulae A lot of mistakes

11. The article's conclusions are derived from the results of research

- Yes Partially No

