

Guidelines for Reviewers

Each article is reviewed by two reviewers outside the author's workplace, one affiliated to a foreign institution.

The reviewers' names are not disclosed, the double-blind review process is used.

The review should include information on (review form attached on the second page):

- Is the problem discussed in the article clearly presented?
- Does the article present an original achievement of the author(s)?
- Do the obtained results refer to results known from literature?
- Are the presented methods proper?
- Are the terminology and the language of the article correct?
- Is the quoted literature relevant and complete?
- Are the illustrations relevant and accurate?

The review is in writing and concludes with an explicit statement whether the article is appropriate to be published in Technical Transactions or not.

The article review process takes up to 2 months.

Ethical Responsibilities Of Reviewers

Contribution to editorial decisions: Peer reviews assist the editor in making editorial decisions and may also help authors to improve their manuscript.

Promptness: Any selected referee who feels unqualified to review the research reported in a manuscript or knows that its timely review will be impossible should notify the editor and excuse himself/herself from the review process.

Confidentiality: All manuscript received for review must be treated as confidential documents. They must not be shown to or discussed with others except those authorized by the editor.

Standards of objectivity: Reviews should be conducted objectively. Personal criticism of the author is inappropriate. Referees should express their views clearly with appropriate supporting arguments.

Acknowledgement of sources: Reviewers should identify the relevant published work that has not been cited by authors. Any substantial similarity or overlap between the manuscript under consideration and any other published paper should be reported to the editor.

Disclosure and conflict of Interest: Privileged information or ideas obtained through peer review must be kept confidential and not used for personal advantage. Reviewers should not consider evaluating manuscripts in which they have conflicts of interest resulting from competitive, collaborative, or other relations with any of the authors, companies, or institutions involved in writing a paper.

ARTICLE REVIEW FORM
submitted for publication in
TECHNICAL TRANSACTIONS

Title:

Detailed assessment:
No

Yes

- | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. Is the problem discussed in the article clearly presented? | ☐ | ☐ |
| 2. Does the article present an original achievement of the author(s)? | ☐ | ☐ |
| 3. Do the obtained results refer to results known from literature? | ☐ | ☐ |
| 4. Are the presented methods proper? | ☐ | ☐ |
| 5. Are the terminology and the language of the article correct? | ☐ | ☐ |
| 6. Is the quoted literature relevant and complete? | ☐ | ☐ |
| 7. Are the illustrations relevant and accurate? | ☐ | ☐ |

Overall assessment:

The article is suitable for publication: ☐ – as presented;
☐ – following minor corrections* .

The article is **not** suitable for publication: ☐ .

Detailed comments:

.....
date and signature of reviewer

* In the detailed comments please specify the necessary points for correction and/or completion.