GUIDELINES FOR REVIEWERS

Thank you for the effort and expertise that you contribute to reviewing process. All reviews help to create and maintain high scientific quality and standards of submissions to New Trends in Production Engineering Conference Proceedings.

Before the evaluation process, please consider following points:

1. Does the article, you are being asked to review, truly match your expertise? The Editorial Board Member, who has assigned you to given article, may not know your specialization precisely. Please, accept an invitation if you are competent to review the article.
2. Do you have enough time to review the article until required date? Reviewing an article can be time consuming. Please consider, if you have sufficient time before the required deadline expires? If you cannot conduct the review let the editor know immediately, and if possible advise the Editorial Board of an alternative reviewers.
3. Are there any conflicts of interest? Resolving all conflicts of interest helps to maintain neutral and fair play reviewing process.

If one or more of listed events occur, please contact us.

REVIEW PROCEDURE

1. The submitted papers are subject to a preliminary technical and content-related assessment made by the editors.
2. After positive editors opinion the paper is pass on to two independent reviewers who are experts in the topic covered by the article.
3. The authors who submit papers to publications agree to the review process.
4. To each paper editorial number is assigned, which identifies it in the later stages of the publishing process.
5. The paper is not sent to the reviewer of the author’s unit and one of the reviewers is employed in a country other than the author of the paper.
6. The review is part of a double-blinded review process in which the identity of the authors and the reviewers are masked.
7. The condition for the publication of the paper is to get positive reviews and to respond to any comments from reviewers, if applicable.
8. After receiving positive reviews, author/authors will be informed with an e-mail.

By viewing the papers, you agree that the review process is confidential. Specifically, you agree not to use ideas and results from submitted papers in your work, research or grant proposals, unless and until that material appears as a published work.

Please find below the reviewer form.
REVIEWER FORM
New Trends in Production Engineering (NTPE)

REVIEWER:
(title, academic degree, name and surname)

Address:
(city, code, street)

TITLE OF THE PAPER:

TYPE AND NATURE OF THE PAPER: theoretical work, experimental, review
(underline appropriate or describe)

SPECIFIC EVALUATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please rate the following by checking an X in the boxes (1 poor, 5 excellent)</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relevance to the topics of the New Trends in Production Engineering Conference Proceedings</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the paper appropriately organized and are the headings indicative of content?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard of English – please indicate below if you think the paper needs proof-reading</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriateness of the research/study method</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance and clarity of text, drawings, graphs and tables</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriateness of abstract as a description of the paper</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Originality of the work</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acknowledgement of the others work by proper references</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance of the research results to the scientific development in the paper area</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference list, adequate and correctly cited</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

REVIEWER COMMENTS:

REVIEWER RECOMMENDATION:

Can this paper be accepted for being published? (underline appropriate)
YES – no changes required
YES – with minor revisions
YES – with major revisions
NOT ACCEPTABLE AT ALL

…………………………………………… ..........................................................
(city, date) (reviewer signature)