1. Conflict of interest declaration and author agreement form
2. Double-blind peer reviewing form of the electronic journal "Technologies of Intellect Development"
3. Example of review form
4. *To the main page of the electronic journal "Technologies of Intellect Development"*

CONFLICT OF INTEREST DECLARATION AND AUTHOR AGREEMENT FORM

It is important that you return this form upon submission. We will not publish your article without completion and return of this form.

Title of Paper:

_____

Please tick one of the following boxes:

☐ We have no conflict of interest to declare.

☐ We have a competing interest to declare (please fill in box below):

This statement is to certify that all Authors have seen and approved the manuscript being submitted. We warrant that the article is the Authors' original work. We warrant that the article has not received prior publication and is not under consideration for publication elsewhere. On behalf of all Co-Authors, the corresponding Author shall bear full responsibility for the submission.

This research has not been submitted for publication nor has it been published in whole or in part elsewhere. We attest to the fact that all Authors listed on the title page have contributed significantly to the work, have read the manuscript, attest to the validity and legitimacy of the data and its interpretation, and agree to its submission to the Journal TECHNOLOGIES OF INTELLECT DEVELOPMENT.

All authors agree that author list is correct in its content and order and that no

modification to the author list can be made without the formal approval of the Editor-in-Chief, and all authors accept that the Editor-in-Chief's decisions over acceptance or rejection or in the event of any breach of the Principles of Ethical Publishing in the Journal TECHNOLOGIES OF INTELLECT DEVELOPMENT being discovered of retraction are final.

No additional authors will be added post submission, unless editors receive agreement from all authors and detailed information is supplied as to why the author list should be amended.

Author Signature Print Name

_____

_____

_____

☐ Please check this box if you are submitting this on behalf of all authors.

DOUBLE-BLIND PEER REVIEWING FORM
OF THE ELECTRONIC JOURNAL
"TECHNOLOGIES OF INTELLECT DEVELOPMENT"

Dear Reviewer!

Please answer "yes" or "no" to the next questions about peer-reviewed article:

1. Does the article apply to scientific direction of the journal?
2. Is article's urgent problem actual?
3. Is the methodological apparatus of research clearly build (goal, objectives, subject, etc.)?
4. Is the article`s method of investigation explicitly described (for experimental research)?
5. Have obtained results a scientific novelty?
6. Have obtained results a theoretical value?
7. Have obtained results a practical value?
8. Area conclusions well-grounded?
9. Are formal standards of article publication's in professional journals followed (correct volume of resume, transliteration links, etc.)?
10. **Choose one of three options for the final conclusion of the review:**

10.1. The article can be published.

10.2. The article can be published after processing in accordance to remarks (specify the remarks).

10.3. The article can't be published (brief summary of why – exactly).

A review can also be writen in free form, but with the conclusions according to parag raph 10.

Thank you for your cooperation!

EXAMPLE OF REVIEW FORM

Presentation checklist

1. Title: Is the title adequate for the content, informative, concise, and clear?

2. Abstract: Is it comprehensive by itself? Is the important and essential information of the article included?

3. References: Are appropriate and adequate references to related works covered sufficiently in the list? 30 references are recommended.

4. Structure and length: Is the overall structure of the article well organized and well balanced? Is the article written with the minimum length necessary for all relevant information?

5. Logic: Is the article written clearly and correctly? Is it logically consistent?

6. Figures and tables: Are they essential and clearly presented?

7. English: Is the English used in the article readable and good enough to convey the scientific meaning correctly?

Scientific quality rating

1. Novelty and originality: Is the article novel and original? Does the article contain material that is new or adds significantly to knowledge already published?

2. Importance and impact: Are the presented results of significant importance and impact to advancement in the relevant field of research? Is this article likely to be cited in the future?

3. Relevance to applied psychology: Is the article scientifically sound and not misleading? Does it provide sufficient in-depth discussion of the application of a psychology or the understanding of psychology in view of its application?

4. Completeness of presentation: Is the presentation complete for a scientific article? Please rate the article by considering the evaluation given in 1.

Overall rating and recommendation

1. Summary of reviewer's evaluation: The results of the reviewer's evaluation are summarized.

2. Recommendation: State the reviewer's opinion on the acceptability of the article by choosing one of the following:

(1) The article may be accepted for publication with/without English correction.

(2) The article may become acceptable after minor revisions of content and/or English as per the reviewer's comments.

(3) The article may need major revision referring to the reviewer's comments.

(4) The article is unacceptable.

How to Write a Reviewer Report

Reviewer's remarks to the authors.

It is useful to provide a concise summary of essential claims in the paper, including both positive and negative points. If it is a great paper, please explain what is so good about it. On the other hand, if you recommend rejection of the paper, you must state the reason for rejection as clearly as possible. If you recommend revision of the paper for possible publication, you must specify what is needed for sufficient improvement of the paper. These comments are sent to the authors and editors.

Reviewer's confidential remarks to the editor

These comments are sent only to the editor responsible for the review of the article, not to the authors.

1. Importance of the article: If you recommend "publish," please concisely describe the background and novelty/importance of the present research to merit its publication in the journal. If you recommend "reject," please briefly provide the reasons.

2. Other comments: Please provide additional information, if any, in relation to the evaluation of the article.