

***begin of Double-Blind Review

1) Title of the Paper:

2) Please describe briefly with your own words what this paper is about:

This paper reports on x ...

3) Originality: Does the paper contain significant content to justify publication? Which are the novel aspects? Is the paper original, i.e. did you check for plagiarism (at least with a quick Google search)?

Novel aspects include the topic x ...

4) Literature: Does the authors demonstrate an adequate understanding of the relevant related work? Are any relevant references missing? Please provide recommendations.

The following important related papers are missing ...

5) Methodology: Is the paper's argument built on an appropriate base of theory and concepts? Are the methods used appropriately described?

The methods x are ...

6) Results: Are the results presented clearly and appropriately? Do the conclusions adequately tie together the other elements of the paper?

The results are ...

7) Quality of Communication: Is the paper well written? Has attention been paid to the clarity of expression and readability, sentence structure, acronym explanation, etc.

The paper is ...

8) Your recommendation (mark or underline):

A) Accept - B) Minor Revision – C) Major Revision – D) Reject

9) On a scale between 0 (rubbish) **to 100** (excellent) – **how would you rate this paper:**

100	90	80	70	60	50	40	30	20	10	0
-----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	---

If you recommended: a) b) or c) – please outline how the authors can improve their paper: What should the authors do? What should they expand/remove etc.? What should they improve?

(use additional space as you need it)

***end of double-blind review