MM-Science Journal Paper Review Form

Please complete and return this form to MM-Science Journal by clicking the 'Submit by Email' button
by _____ at the latest

Reviewer No: _____   **for the paper No:** _____

Title of the paper:

_____

Paper's overall score (min 0; max 1): [   ]

Kind of the intended paper

The MM-Science Journal invites high-quality submissions on substantial, original and previously unpublished research. Applied, theoretical, results-oriented and speculative papers from both academia and industry will all be considered for inclusion. Contributions are classified into and are reviewed in the following categories:

- **Research Papers** describing contributions and the latest results of scientific work.
- **Industrial Papers** should signal industrial needs for design approaches/techniques, experiences from their implementation and use, experiences from training of engineers, demands on computer support, best practice, qualitative case studies, etc.
- **Design Education Papers** should be based on a scientific approach describing substantial new experiences based on design education training, teamwork, projects or cases.
- **Philosophy or Speculations Papers** provide a category for contributions where the author has a free hand to evolve new ideas without a claim for scientific validation. However, the paper should be rigorously related to state-of-the-art literature and clearly indicate the novelty of the ideas.

For a proper evaluation and use of correct criteria we ask you to classify:

Please select:

- ○ [A] A research paper
- ○ [B] An industrial paper
- ○ [C] An educational paper
- ○ [D] A philosophy or speculation paper

I. How strong is the intended papers's content?

1. Indicate the intended paper's topicality and significance
Please select:

- ○ [0 p.] Useless and/or not significant theme and/or subject
- ○ [1 p.] Not topical and/or not significant theme and/or subject
- ○ [2 p.] Up to date however less significant theme and/or subject
- ○ [3 p.] Up to date and significant theme and/or subject
- ○ [4 p.] New challenging and significant theme and/or subject

2. Indicate the intended paper's novelty and level of contribution to present knowledge
Please select:

- ○ [0 p.] General and/or unarticulated material
- ○ [1 p.] Repetition of known material
- ○ [2 p.] New application of known material
- ○ [3 p.] New theory contributions or additions
- ○ [4 p.] Innovative contribution to theory, methods or models

3. Are the discourse and conclusions valid?

Please select:

- ○ [0 p.] Not justified, no message
- ○ [1 p.] Major omissions, weak justification
- ○ [2 p.] Loose generalisations, weak polemic
- ○ [3 p.] Good justification, reasonable discourse
- ○ [4 p.] Strong justification, strong discourse

4. Is an industrial or application perspective reflected in a reasonable way by the author(s)?

Please select:

- ○ [0 p.] No comments included
- ○ [1 p.] Naive, invalid arguments
- ○ [2 p.] Questionable reflection on industrial scope
- ○ [3 p.] Reasonable reflection on industrial scope
- ○ [4 p.] Strong, convincing reflection

for [A]: Are the scientific methods and reviews clearly described? Is a scientific contribution proved?

5. for [B/D]: Is the industrial reasoning from symptoms, diagnosis, and improvements to results strong?

for [C]: Does the extended abstract show good pedagogic understanding?

○ [0 p.] No description included	[0 p.] No comments included	[0 p.] No educational aspects introduced
○ [1 p.] Poor or sparse hints to methodics	[1 p.] Jump to conclusion, no justification	[1 p.] Poor understanding
○ [2 p.] Questionable, insufficient description	[2 p.] Major omissions, unclear reasoning	[2 p.] Inadequate reflections
○ [3 p.] Reasonable description and application of methods and reviews	[3 p.] Reasonable thread of reasoning	[3 p.] Reasonable educational aspects
○ [4 p.] Rigour in scientific reasoning, methods and reviews	[4 p.] Strong, convincing reasoning	[4 p.] Good educational understanding

6. Are the references adequate and state-of-the-art?

Please select:

- ○ [0 p.] No references
- ○ [1 p.] Apparently only own references
- ○ [2 p.] Less adequate references
- ○ [3 p.] Reasonable references shown
- ○ [4 p.] Central state-of-the-art references

Your overall score of the content strength [min 0; max 1] is: $(\sum I.)/24 = 0.xx =$

Concerns and advice regarding the content strengths:

Your task as a reviewer is to advise the author(s) as to how to improve the intended paper and making it relevant for MM Science Journal. You must therefore explain to the author(s) about your concerns and give them advice.

II. How well is the intended paper written?

1. Is the intended paper well structured and organised?

Please select:

○ [0 p.] Inadequate structure

○ [1 p.] Irrelevant material included

○ [2 p.] Inadequate content/length relation

○ [3 p.] Reasonable structure

○ [4 p.] Good structure

2. Is the use of English satisfactory?

Please select:

○ [0 p.] Unacceptable language, obscure terminology

○ [1 p.] Extensive revision necessary

○ [2 p.] Needs some revisions as indicated

○ [3 p.] Acceptable

○ [4 p.] Good grammar and vocabulary

3. Are the illustrations and tables clear, effective and understandable?

Please select:

○ [0 p.] Unacceptable

○ [1 p.] Major flaws, missing illustrations

○ [2 p.] Partly inadequate

○ [3 p.] Reasonable clear concept

○ [4 p.] Complete, precise

Your overall score of the formal qualities [min 0; max 1] is: ($\sum$ II.)/ 12= 0.yy =

Instructions and advice regarding the formal qualities:

As a reviewer you should also advise the author(s) concerning the formal aspects of the intended paper. Please give your instructions and advice here.

Review summary and recommendation

Based upon your scoring of the paper manuscript:

the content strength [min 0; max 1] is: 0,xx =

_____

the formal qualities [min 0; max 1] is: 0,yy =

_____

i.e. overall score [min 0; max 1] is: (24 x 0,xx + 12 x 0,yy)/36 = 0,zz =

From it follows, that your final evaluation of the intended paper is:

0	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.5	0.6	0.7	0.8	0.9	1
not acceptable		acceptable with major revisions		acceptable with minor revisions		acceptable as it is				
☐		☐		☐				☐		

In case your overall score is over 0.85 it is a must to comment and reason so high rating (paper must be really exceptionally quality to be rated by so high rating). Please, write down a few 5 sentences explaining such a high evaluation into section Comments to the MM Science Journal redaction (next page).

Reflection

What is your competence as a referee in relation to the actual paper and topic?

Please select:

○   I am an expert in the subject area of the paper

○   I am knowledgeable in the area but not an expert

○   I am not an expert; my evaluation is that of an informed outsider

Do you have comments to the MM Science Journal redaction (not to be forward to the author(s)) concerning your evaluation, the paper, your comments etc ?

Please check when ready:

○   **This is my final version of the review**