

Type of review type - four-level:

- 1) by editor-in-chief;
- 2) managing editor;
- 3) one-sided blind (anonymous) review of a foreign scientist, not affiliated with the author (s), who provided a full report in the language in which the article was written (Kazakh, Russian, English)
- 4) one-sided blind (anonymous) peer review by unaffiliated scientists from Kyzylorda University named after Korkyt Ata.

If the opinions of the reviewers (scientists of the Kyzylorda University named after Korkyt Ata, foreign and Kazakhstani) on the publication of the article are divided, the final decision will be made by the scientific editor.

The review procedure includes the following steps:

1. The editor-in-chief for the issue checks the article for compliance with the design rules. Further, the article is sent for peer online -review by a PhD candidate or doctor of science whose scientific specialization is closest to the subject of a scientific article.
2. Terms of reviewing the article may vary depending on the specific situation but should not exceed 15 working days.
3. The reviewer can not be an author or co-author of the work under review, as well as scientific advisers of applicants for a degree, PhD and employees of the department where the author works in. Reviews are discussed by the editorial board and serve as the basis for accepting or rejecting manuscripts.
4. 5. The article is provided to the reviewer online without specifying any information about the authors. The review should objectively evaluate the scientific article and contain a comprehensive analysis of its scientific and methodological advantages and disadvantages. The review is drawn up according to the standard form suggested by the editors or in free form.

The following items should be briefly evaluated in the review (expert evaluation):

general scientific level of paper;
title and its compliance with the content of the article;
relevance of the topic;
scientific novelty;
practical significance of the findings presented;
work structure;
the existence of discussion and / or incorrect provisions;
what are the exact advantages or disadvantages of the article, what corrections and additions should be made by the author;
and also the opinion of the reviewer (expert) on the possibility or impossibility of publishing the manuscript is to be expressed.

Reviews are certified in the manner prescribed by the institution where the reviewer works. Copies of the review content are submitted to the author(s) within a week after the acceptance of the expert opinion by editorial board.

The article sent to the author for revision should be returned in corrected form within 10 days with corrections marked in the article.

The editorial board reserves a right to reject articles in the event of the inability or unwillingness of the author to take into account the wishes of the editorial board.

The review of materials submitted to the editorial board of the journal "Bulletin of the Korkyt Ata Kyzylorda University" is carried out in a confidential manner and the name of the reviewer(s) is not reported to the author(s). Violation of confidentiality is possible only in the case of the reviewer's statement about the unreliability or falsification of the materials set forth in the article.

The originals of the reviews are kept both in the editorial board of the journal "Bulletin of the Korkyt Ata Kyzylorda University " for three years and to provide to the competent authorities on request.

REVIEW

Article title:	
Reviewer: Full name, academic degree and title, position	
Date:	

Content evaluation

Study object

	Formulated clearly and accurately
	Should be defined more clearly
	Not clear, should be reformulated
Reviewer's comment:	

Theoretical foundations and explanations

	The author expresses an original point of view
	There are enough links to previous studies
	Lack of links to other studies
	The theoretical background is missing or unclear
Reviewer's comment:	

Information and data provided

	New, original
	Expand and supplement already known information
	Repeat already known information
	Obscure
Reviewer's comment:	

Research method

	Well grounded and consistent
	Insufficiently substantiated, should be reconsidered
	Method unclear
	Not required for this kind of work
Reviewer's comment:	

Problem solving and analysis of results

	Very well grounded
	Reasonable enough
	Poorly grounded, should be revisited
	Not clear and / or too abstract
	Descriptive work

Reviewer's comment:

Evaluation form

Name

<input type="checkbox"/>	Clear and precise
<input type="checkbox"/>	Should be revised
Reviewer's comment:	

Language style

<input type="checkbox"/>	A great
<input type="checkbox"/>	Free enough
<input type="checkbox"/>	Understandable
<input type="checkbox"/>	Hard to understand
Reviewer's comment:	

Tables, graphs, etc.

<input type="checkbox"/>	Acceptable
<input type="checkbox"/>	Should be revised
<input type="checkbox"/>	Missing / not required
Reviewer's comment:	

List of used literature

<input type="checkbox"/>	Acceptable
<input type="checkbox"/>	Should be edited
Reviewer's comment:	

Annotation

<input type="checkbox"/>	Acceptable
<input type="checkbox"/>	Should be edited
<input type="checkbox"/>	Should be revised
Reviewer's comment:	

Conclusions

<input type="checkbox"/>	Publish as provided
<input type="checkbox"/>	Accept with minor changes
<input type="checkbox"/>	Accept with significant changes
<input type="checkbox"/>	Reject as it stands, but with the possibility of re-filing
<input type="checkbox"/>	Reject without the possibility of re-filing

Reviewer's comment:
