## ENGINEERING TRANSACTIONS

## **ROZPRAWY INŻYNIERSKIE**

INSTYTUT PODSTAWOWYCH PROBLEMÓW TECHNIKI (IPPT PAN) INSTITUTE OF FUNDAMENTAL TECHNOLOGICAL RESEARCH A. Pawińskiego 5 B 02-106 Warsaw, Poland, http://www.ippt.gov.pl EDITORIAL OFFICE Phone (48 22) 826 60 22 Fax (48 22) 826 98 15 e-mail: engtrans@ippt.gov.pl

## **Review Form**

Title of the paper:

Author(s):

General comments and specific suggestions to author(s) (please be expansive as possible and justify your recommendations regarding suitability for publication in Engineering Transactions with specific comments regarding):

(1) changes to improve the quality of the manuscript

(2) changes that must be made before publication can be considered.

## **Review guidelines:**

Does the title of this manuscript clearly and sufficiently reflect its content?

Is the abstract/summary informative?

Is the technical material plausible and free of error?

Are equations presented with acceptable clarity?

Are the figures, illustrations and tables acceptable?

Are all the assumptions clearly stated?

Are data and results accurately and properly appraised?

Is the relevance & application of the work made apparent?

Are the interpretations and conclusions sound and justified by the data?

Are the references relevant?

Can you suggest additions or amendments that will increase the value of this manuscript?

Can you suggest any reductions (or deletions of parts) in the manuscript?

Is the manuscript free of commercialism?

Are you aware of prior publication of this work?

		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
1.	Character of the manuscript:	original
		review-type
		technical note
2.	Contents of the manuscript:	new results
		continuation of previous papers
		review
		review author's own research
		other
3.	Formulation of the aim and the range of	clear
	the manuscript:	average
		poor
4.	Realization of the aim and the range of	consequent
	the manuscript:	superficial
5.	Relevance of the results:	high
		good
		satisfactory
		poor
6.	Quality of language	written in proper English
		needs verification
		poor, needs rewriting by author(s)
7.	General estimate of the manuscript:	high
	-	good
		satisfactory
		poor
8.	Final conclusion:	accept with no revisions
		the manuscript needs minor revisions
		the manuscript needs major revisions (requiring new review, see comments)
		the manuscript is not recommended for publication (see comments)