

## Peer Review

The review process aims at admission of the submitted papers to participation in the International Scientific Symposium "Metrology and Metrological Assurance" (MMA) and observation of the ethical norms for the papers publication on paper and in electronic format. This activity is administered by the Chair of the MMA International Program Committee (IPC) (the chief editor) and is carried out by the members of the MMA IPC (the editorial board). The scientific competence of the members of the MMA IPC covers all thematic areas of the Symposium MMA. The reviewing is „Single blind peer-review“ and includes the following activities:

1. Submission of the paper(s) on the website of the Symposium MMA in electronic format as an attached file not later than the announced deadline.
2. Assignment of a reviewer for each paper according to the thematic area of the paper and the field of scientific competence of the reviewer.
3. Each reviewer via admin tool of the website downloads the full text of the submitted paper with the data about the authors with information of the deadline of 15 days for reviewing and the deadline of 7 days for a decline from reviewing. The reviewer has to inform the MMA IPC about a decline or impossibility to observe the reviewing deadline within 7 days in order a new reviewer to be assigned.
4. The reviewer reads the paper and assesses it according to the Criteria for assessment of the reports given in the Referee Report. It contains: Data of the reviewed paper – title, author(s); I. Reviewer's competence in the field of the paper; II. Paper assessment criteria; III. Proposal for the IPC. In the review form the specific indicators and the corresponding marks assigned are also presented. For more information please see the Referee Report.
5. After preparing of the Referee Report, the reviewer uploads it via admin tool to the website. Both the MMA IPC and the author(s) can access the Referee Report with preserving the anonymity of the reviewer (the name of the reviewer and the data about his competence are hidden). The author(s) have to consider the reviewer's comments and recommendations if any within 7 day. In case if the author(s) are disagree with the reviewer's comments, the MMA IPC assigns a second reviewer, sends him the paper and the new deadline for the submitting of the second Referee Report. After the second Referee Report the MMA IPC takes the final decision on the acceptance/rejection of the paper.
6. With the submissions of the paper by the author(s) and of the Referee Report by the reviewer to the MMA website they are considered to have accepted and observed the requirements and obligations of the Ethical Norms – please see on the website of the International Scientific Symposium MMA.

# REFeree REPORT

Title:.....

Author(s):.....

Reviewer:.....

## I. YOUR COMPETENCE IN THE SUBJECT OF THE REPORTS

- I am expert
- I am no expert but I know the area
- Peripheral, superficial
- General knowledge

## II. CRITERIA FOR ASSESSMENT OF THE REPORTS

<b>1. Importance of the contributions</b>	<b>Rating</b>
Excellent work with substantial contributions	<input type="checkbox"/> 6
Very good work with some contributions	<input type="checkbox"/> 5
Good work but without any contributions	<input type="checkbox"/> 4
Not profound and non-essential work	<input type="checkbox"/> 3
<b>2. Originality of contributions and ideas</b>	<b>Rating</b>
Original work	<input type="checkbox"/> 6
Contains original ideas and contributions	<input type="checkbox"/> 5
Unclear originality of ideas	<input type="checkbox"/> 4
Summarizes experience and information	<input type="checkbox"/> 3
Offers no original ideas	<input type="checkbox"/> 2
<b>3. Quality of presentation and layout</b>	<b>Rating</b>
Excellent written and designed	<input type="checkbox"/> 6
Very well written and designed	<input type="checkbox"/> 5
Well written and designed	<input type="checkbox"/> 4
Needs significant editorial corrections	<input type="checkbox"/> 3
Incomprehensibly written and poorly designed	<input type="checkbox"/> 2
<b>4. Volume of report</b>	<b>Rating</b>
Acceptable	<input type="checkbox"/> 6
Too long - see comments to the authors	<input type="checkbox"/> 4
Too short - see comments to the authors	<input type="checkbox"/> 3
<b>5. Abstract of the report</b>	<b>Rating</b>
Fully represents the essence of the report	<input type="checkbox"/> 6
Incompletely represents the essence of the report - see comments to the authors	<input type="checkbox"/> 4
Poor translation - see comments to the authors	<input type="checkbox"/> 3

<b>6. Does report correspond of the topics</b>		<b>Rating</b>
Fully complies		<input type="checkbox"/> 6
Partly matches		<input type="checkbox"/> 4
Does not comply		<input type="checkbox"/> 2
<b>7. Overall assessment (averaged over p. II.1 to p. II.6)</b>		
Excellent report	Rating - over 5.5	<input type="checkbox"/> Accepted
Very good report	Rating - over 5	<input type="checkbox"/> Accepted
Good report	Rating - over 4	<input type="checkbox"/> Accepted
Satisfactory report	Rating - over 3	<input type="checkbox"/> Accepted by way of exception
Weak report	Rating - below 3	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejected
<b>8. Additional requirements - see comments for authors</b>		<b>YES</b> <b>NOT</b>
Editorial corrections		<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
Title refining		<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
Abstract refining		<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
Translation refining		<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
Report shortening/supplementing		<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>

**9. Comments about the authors (if any):** .....

.....

.....

**III. PROPOSAL FOR INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMME COMMITTEE**

**Thematic topic (section):** .....

**Comments (if any):** .....

.....

.....

**Date:**.....

**Reviewer:**.....