Referee's report for NJC

Paper No. ______________________

Author(s): ______________________

Title: ______________________

____

Recommendation to be withheld from the Author:

- ☐ Accept in present shape
- ☐ Accept after minor revision
- ☐ Major revision followed by new referee procedure
- ☐ Reject
- ☐ Suggest the Author to offer to other journal ______________________

or ______________________

Other Comments to be withheld from the Author:

Date: __________ **Signature:** ______________________

Address: ______________________

____

Phone: __________ **Email:** ______________________

Comments for the Author(s)

Evaluation

☐ Excellent ☐ Good ☐ Fair ☐ Poor ☐ Outside the scope of NJC

Overview

A. Content

1. Is this paper of original value?
   - ☐ Yes, definitely
   - ☐ To some extent
   - ☐ Hardly
2. Is the paper scientifically correct?
   - ☐ Yes
   - ☐ Probably, although all details have not been checked
   - ☐ Doubtful (for detailed criticism: see below)
3. To what extent will the results be useful for other scientists?
   - ☐ Large
   - ☐ Average
   - ☐ Small
4. How would you characterize the level of the paper?
   - ☐ For experts only
   - ☐ Useful for people working in related fields
   - ☐ Understandable also for nonspecialists
   - ☐ Superficial
5. Is the bibliography reasonable?
   - ☐ Yes
   - ☐ After minor modifications (for details: see below)
   - ☐ No

B. Presentation

1. Is the title adequate?
   - ☐ Yes
   - ☐ No. If no, please suggest alternative
2. Does the abstract give a correct description of the contents?
   - ☐ Yes
   - ☐ No. If no, please suggest improvements below
3. Is general organization of the paper acceptable
   - ☐ Yes
   - ☐ No (for suggestions: see below)
4. With respect to the contents, is the length of the paper reasonable?
   - ☐ Yes
   - ☐ No; should be increased
   - ☐ No; should be decreased
5. How would you rate readability?
   - ☐ Good
   - ☐ Some effort needed
   - ☐ Large efforts needed
   - ☐ Unreadable

Detailed comments (use additional sheets if necessary)