

REVIEW
of the scientific work _____ **presented to**

Criteria for evaluating student scientific works (first stage)

1. Review of the works:

2.

- | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|
| 1 | Relevance to the section | 5 | |
| 2 | Presence of a scientific result | 5 | |
| 3 | Practical value | 5 | |
| 4 | The work satisfies formal requirements | 5 | The work should be removed from the competition |
| 5 | Plagiarism* >25% | | |

No.	Characteristics and criteria for evaluating the manuscript of a scientific work. ¹	Rating. The maximum number of points (on the 100-point scale)	Points
1	Relevance of the problem	5	
2	Novelty and originality of ideas	15	
3	Presentation quality	5	
4	Theoretical scientific results	20	
5	Practical orientation of results (documents that confirm deployment of the results)	20	
6	Level of use of scientific literature and other sources of information	5	
7	Degree of independence of the work	10	
8	Quality of the report presentation and correctness and relevance of answers to questions	15	
9	Scientific publications	5	
10	Negative aspects of the work (explain the reduction of maximum points in the items 1-9):		
Total points			

General conclusion _____

(the work is recommended, not recommended to be presented at the scientific-practical conference)

Reviewer _____

(signature) (Full name, place of work, position, scientific degree)
