**Review of the manuscript**

**MANUSCRIPT title**

**(*Vestnik of Saint Petersburg University. History*)**

Dear peer reviewer,

The Editorial Board would appreciate your answering the following questions upon your assessment of the manuscript:

**1. What are the main claims of the manuscript? Are they novel (original) in their content and/or interpretation? If yes, what is new and/or original about them?**

**2. How does the manuscript correlate with the existent scholarship and current research in the relevant subject field?**

**3. Is there any evidence of plagiarism or other forms of academic misconduct in the manuscript**?

**4. Is the text of the manuscript coherent and clear? Do the conclusions conform to the data supplied? Does the structure of the manuscript fit the Journal’s guidelines? Is the language and style appropriate, is the terminology used correctly? Are the tables, charts, figures, etc. illustrative? Do the footnotes, references, citations of the published and unpublished primary sources conform to the Journal’s guidelines?**

**5. Would the reviewed manuscript be of interest to the readership of *Vestnik Saint Petersburg University. History*? If yes, what would make the readers interested?**

**6. Other comments:**

**Upon reviewing the manuscript, please select one of following recommendations (you may highlight, underline, or encircle selected option):**

1. To accept the manuscript for publication in its original form (without any revisions).

2. To accept the manuscript for publication once the author has considered the revisions suggested by the referee (the author decides if to apply the revisions or not).

3. To accept the manuscript for publication once the reviewers’ revisions are implemented.

4. To reject the manuscript with the option of resubmission.

5. To reject the manuscript without the option of resubmission.