

ARTICLE REVIEW FORM*

REVIEWER A / B

Paper received at:(date).....

REFERENCE NUMBER (ID):

PAPER TITLE:

AUTHORS:

I. GENERAL (Mark with X)

<p>1 – Character</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Theoretical</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Experimental</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Review</p>	<p>2 – Does it comply with the journal profile?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> To a certain extent.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No.</p>	<p>3 – Is it original ?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No</p>
<p>4 – Is the subject relevant for the wood processing sector?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p>5 – Is it well readable (use of English language; specific terms etc.)?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No.</p>	

II. Please evaluate:

- the novelty and scientific character of the paper;
- the correlation between title and contents;
- if the method is clearly and detailed enough explained;
- if the conclusions are well supported by the presented data and
- if the cited references are sufficient and relevant

* The content of this form is confidential. The name of the scientific referee is not accessible to the author(s).

III. REVIEW RESULT (Mark with X)

- The paper is able to be published as such, without any modifications.
- The paper is able to be published, with minor revision.
- The paper is able to be published, with major revision.
- The paper is rejected because:
 - it contains major flaws
 - it is confuse
 - the subject is not enough developed
 - same subject has been published before by other authors
 - other:

IV. REVIEWER'S COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE AUTHOR

.....

V. REVIEWER'S COMMENTS TO THE EDITOR

.....

End of review:(date).....