

# ARCHIVES FOR TECHNICAL SCIENCES

UDC: 62

DOI: 10.7251

ISSN 1840-4855  
e-ISSN 2233-0046

## REVIEWER'S REPORT

<b>Submitted for review:</b>	<b>Reviewed:</b>
<b>Title of the article:</b>	
<b>Code of the article:</b>	<b>Code of the reviewer:</b>

- In sections I to III fill the corresponding fields with one of the values from the range offered in brackets.
- Maximum number of points that article can get is 100; 40 for scientific - professional level, 30 for technical level and 30 for general quality.

### FORM RETURN BY ELECTRONIC MAIL, DEADLINE

#### I SCIENTIFIC – PROFESSIONAL LEVEL

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 1. Relevancy for Archives for technical sciences – thematic field (0 ÷ 10)..... |  |
| 2. Originality of the theme (0 ÷ 10).....                                       |  |
| 3. Applicability of results of the article (0 ÷ 10).....                        |  |
| 4. Scientific contribution of the article (0 ÷ 10).....                         |  |

#### II TECHNICAL LEVEL

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| 1. Conciseness and clarity of expression (0 ÷ 10).....   |  |
| 2. Formatting, technique – quality of illustrations, tables, compliance of marks (0 ÷ 10)..... |  |
| 3. Quality of reference (actuality, relevant references of other authors) (0 ÷ 5).....         |  |
| 4. Does the title matches the content of the article (0 ÷ 5).....                              |  |

#### III GENERAL MARK FOR THE QUALITY OF THE ARTICLE (0 ÷ 30)

#### IV OVERALL MARK (Sum of the previous sections I to III)

General criteria for the evaluation of the article are given in Instructions for reviewers. It is considered that article with less than 50 points is not worthy of publishing in Archives. Same applies for the article that gets < 5 points in questions I.1, I.2, I.4 (except for professional article) or < 20 in III.

#### V RECOMMENDATIONS FOR EDITORIAL BOARD (must be filled)

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| 1. <b>Accept without any changes</b> .....   |  |
| 2. Accept with small changes of technical nature *.....  |  |
| 3. Accept with small changes of scientific – professional nature*.....                                 |  |
| 4. Accept only if essential changes are made*.....   |  |
| 5. <b>Article is unconditionally rejected</b> (explain on second page of reviewer's sheet - MANDATORY) |  |

\* Comment on the second side of the report

#### VI CATEGORIZATION OF ARTICLE (after fulfilling all the requirements in questions I - V.4)

##### Scientific article

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| 1. Original scientific article (if has per 8 and more points in questions I.2. and I.4.).....      |  |
| 2. Review article (if has per 6 and more points in questions I.2. and I.4.).....                   |  |
| 3. Preliminary report (if has per 5 and more points in questions I.2. and I.4. and 6 in I.3.)..... |  |
| 4. Academic Overview (if has per 5 and more points in questions I.2. and I.4.).....                |  |

##### Professional article

(if has 6 or more points in question I.3.)

Categorization scientific and professional articles is given in the Instructions for Reviewers

**VII COMPETENCE OF THE REVIEWER** (enter one of the below given categories).....

- **K=5** – expert in the field that is process in the article,
- **K=4** – very good knowledge of the scientific field,
- **K=3** – general knowledge of the scientific field,
- **K=2** – poor knowledge of the scientific field,
- **K=1** – unfamiliarity with the scientific field.

When considering the evaluation of article, **Editorial board** unconditionally respects reviewers assessment only if their competence is ranked with  $K \geq 4$ .

In cases of  $K=3$  or  $K=2$  **Editorial board** can consult another reviewer, and in case of  $K=1$  article should be returned to **Editorial board** immediately.

### REVIEWER'S COMMENTS TO THE AUTHORS

Make sure that full Reviewer's report is delivered to the author/s and due to that not fill any data that can undermine the anonymity of the reviewer. Comments should be filled exclusively with printed letters. (Add new pages in necessary and numerate them properly).

<b>1. Remarks of technical nature</b>	
<b>2. Small remarks of scientific – professional nature</b>	
<b>3. Essential remarks from which depends the acceptance of the article</b>	
<b>4. General comments</b>	
<b>Signature of reviewer:</b>	