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 that the announced deadline.

2. Assignment of two reviewers 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 days. MMA IPC takes the final decision on the acceptance/rejectionof 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

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

Poor translation - see comments to the authors	☐ 3
6. Does report correspond of the topics	**Rating**
Fully complies	☐ 6
Partly matches	☐ 4
Does not comply	☐ 2

7. Overall assessment (averaged over p. II.1 to p. II.6)		
Excellent report	Rating - over 5.5	☐ Accepted
Very good report	Rating - over 5	☐ Accepted
Good report	Rating - over 4	☐ Accepted
Satisfactory report	Rating - over 3	☐ Accepted by way of exception
Weak report	Rating - below 3	☐ Rejected

8. Additional requirements - see comments for authors	**YES**	**NOT**
Editorial corrections	☐	☐
Title refining	☐	☐
Abstract refining	☐	☐
Translation refining	☐	☐
Report shortening/supplementing	☐	☐

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

.....

.....

III. PROPOSAL FOR INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMME COMMITTEE

Thematic topic (section): .....

Publication of the paper	**YES**	**NOT**
IEEE Xplore Digital Library	☐	☐
Proceedings of the ISS “MMA”	☐	☐

Comments (if any): .....

.....

.....

Date:..... **Reviewer:.....**