

ANNUAL OF NAVIGATION

.....
Reviewer Name and Family Name
.....

REVIEW OF THE ARTICLE

.....
author (authors) and article title
.....

	yes	no	without opinion
1. Does the paper significantly contribute to the progress in the field of navigation or related disciplines?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Does the paper introduce new and original material?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Do the title, abstract of the paper and keywords clearly reflect its contents?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Whether the paper is correct in respect of essential?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Is the manuscript written in correct English?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Do you recommend publication of the paper			
• in the present form?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
• after revision?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Does the paper should be rejected?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Do you recommend repeating the review procedure after revision?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

ANNUAL OF NAVIGATION

Reviewer's comments which are not reflected in the first part of the review:

.....
(signature)