

Journal Information Technologies and Control
Referee Report

1. Your competence in the subject matter of the paper

<input type="checkbox"/>	Expert
<input type="checkbox"/>	General
<input type="checkbox"/>	Marginal

2. Importance of the contribution

<input type="checkbox"/>	Excellent work and a major contribution
<input type="checkbox"/>	Good solid work of some contribution
<input type="checkbox"/>	Good solid work but marginal
<input type="checkbox"/>	Marginal work and very minor

3. Technical quality

<input type="checkbox"/>	Highly original work
<input type="checkbox"/>	Contains an original contribution
<input type="checkbox"/>	Somewhat original
<input type="checkbox"/>	Variation of a known subject
<input type="checkbox"/>	Completely lack original ideas

4. Quality of presentation

<input type="checkbox"/>	Very good
<input type="checkbox"/>	Basically well written
<input type="checkbox"/>	Readable
<input type="checkbox"/>	Needs considerable work
<input type="checkbox"/>	Unreadable

5. Length of contribution

<input type="checkbox"/>	Reasonable for material covered
<input type="checkbox"/>	Too long; unnecessary material, see comments to authors
<input type="checkbox"/>	Too short, suggest adding material, see comments to authors

6. Abstract

<input type="checkbox"/>	Satisfactory
<input type="checkbox"/>	Unsatisfactory

7. Is the subject matter of the paper within the general scope of Journal

<input type="checkbox"/>	I think so
<input type="checkbox"/>	Maybe
<input type="checkbox"/>	I do not think so

8. Language Style and Quality

<input type="checkbox"/>	Satisfactory
<input type="checkbox"/>	Unsatisfactory

9. References Actuality

<input type="checkbox"/>	Satisfactory
<input type="checkbox"/>	Unsatisfactory

10. Overall rating

<input type="checkbox"/>	Strong accept (very good quality)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Accept (good quality)
<input type="checkbox"/>	New referee after correction
<input type="checkbox"/>	Definitely reject (no merit)