

Please, evaluate each criterion, according to a unified rating scale divided into four units: “poor”, “major revision”, “minor revision”, “good”

## GENERAL INFORMATION

**Article Title:**

## CRITERIA

REVIEW CRITERIA	QUESTIONS	SCALE	COMMENTS of REVIEWER
<b>Originality</b>	<p>Are the problems discussed in the article new?</p> <p>Does the article point out differences from related research?</p> <p>Does the article describe an innovative combination of techniques from different disciplines?</p> <p>Does the article introduce an idea that appears promising or might stimulate others to develop promising alternatives?</p>	<p>poor</p> <p>major revision</p> <p>minor revision</p> <p>good</p>	
<b>Significance</b>	<p>Does the article have a considerable contribution to a certain area of research?</p> <p>Does the article stimulate discussion of important issues or alternative points of view?</p>	<p>poor</p> <p>major revision</p> <p>minor revision</p> <p>good</p>	
<b>Relevance</b>	<p>Does the article contain a suggestive section where it is presented?</p> <p>Does the article present some relevant information for its area of research?</p>	<p>poor</p> <p>major revision</p> <p>minor revision</p> <p>good</p>	
<b>Presentation</b>	<p>Does the article have a logic structure?</p> <p>Is the article written clear enough?</p> <p>Is the article written correctly (from a standpoint of the English grammar)?</p> <p>Does the article present the terminology for its area of interest in an appropriate way?</p>	<p>poor</p> <p>major revision</p> <p>minor revision</p> <p>good</p>	

<b>Title</b>	Does the title express clearly a content of the article?	poor major revision minor revision good	
<b>Abstract</b>	<p>Is the abstract informative enough?</p> <p>Does the abstract describe the research and the results to the full extent?</p> <p>Does the abstract provide a good perspective on the final message of the article?</p>	poor major revision minor revision good	
<b>Introduction</b>	<p>Does the introduction highlight correctly current problems in the area?</p> <p>Does the introduction specify research objectives?</p> <p>Does the introduction present the article's contribution to theory of the research area and/or practical improvements?</p>	poor major revision minor revision good	
<b>Results</b>	<p>Are the results presented clear?</p> <p>Are all the relevant connections with other works declared?</p> <p>Is the literature used in support of the performed research comprehensive enough and up-to-date?</p> <p>Do the results avoid significantly misinterpretation?</p> <p>Do the results avoid sufficiently assumptions and speculations?</p>	poor major revision minor revision good	
<b>Conclusions</b>	<p>Are the conclusions explained correctly / logically?</p> <p>Do the conclusions sufficiently avoid misinterpretation?</p> <p>Do the conclusions sufficiently avoid too general or biased information?</p>	poor major revision minor revision good	

<b>References</b>	<p>Do the references reflect the latest work/research in the considered area?</p> <p>Are the references correctly indicated in the article?</p>	<p>poor</p> <p>major revision</p> <p>minor revision</p> <p>good</p>	
<b>Data representation</b>	<p>Does the data presented in tables describe and interpret a topic of the paper correctly?</p> <p>How reliable are the data used and statistics used?</p>	<p>poor</p> <p>major revision</p> <p>minor revision</p> <p>good</p>	
<b>Graphs and figures</b>	<p>Do graphs and figures illustrate the discussed subject properly?</p> <p>Does the data presented in graphs and figures describe and interpret a topic of the paper correctly?</p>	<p>poor</p> <p>major revision</p> <p>minor revision</p> <p>good</p>	
<b>PLAGIARISM</b>	<p>If the article (or some parts from the article) is suspected to be a substantial copy of some earlier work, the article should be rejected.</p>	<p>accept</p> <p>reject</p>	

**FINAL DECISION**

**Rejected**

**Should be revised and resubmitted**

**Accepted with minor changes**

**Accepted**