

EDITORIAL OFFICE  
Machine GRAPHICS & VISION  
Institute of Information Technology  
Warsaw University of Life Sciences – SGGW  
Nowoursynowska 159  
02-776 WARSAW, Poland

phone: +48 (22) 593 7227  
fax: +48 (22) 593 7211

e-mail: MGV@sggw.edu.pl

Date:

## REFEREE REPORT FORM

Dear Referee:

Please complete<sup>1</sup> Sections I-IV of this review form and send it to the return address given above before the date indicated.

Sections I and II are for the editors' eyes only; Sections III and IV will be returned to the author(s).

Please return this form to e-mail MGV@sggw.edu.pl .

Name of the Referee .....

Date to be Returned: .....

Paper No.

Revision No.

Title: .....

### I. REFEREE'S RECOMMENDATIONS

#### RECOMMENDATION

- Accept with no changes
- Accept after minor revisions (second review not needed)
- Revise and resubmit
- Reject

#### CATEGORY

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> State-of-the-art survey | <input type="checkbox"/> Advanced industrial application  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Research paper          | <input type="checkbox"/> Advanced educational application |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Tutorial paper          | <input type="checkbox"/> Software development             |

#### GENERAL COMMENT

---

<sup>1</sup> for instance  (shift+Q) instead of

A) II. REFEREE'S COMMENTS FOR THE EDITORS' EYES ONLY  
[THIS PART WILL BE WITHHELD FROM AUTHOR(S)]

Date Completed:

Referee's Signature:

---

MACHINE GRAPHICS & VISION  
REFEREE REPORT FORM  
[THIS PART WILL BE SENT TO AUTHOR(S)]

Paper No. ....Revision No. ....  
Title: .....

**III. OVERVIEW**

Please tick all appropriate answers below, or write N/A (not applicable).  
Note that the answers are not necessarily disjoint within their respective categories.

- SCOPE**
- Of general relevance
  - Relevant to the field of .....
  - Very specialised
  - Out of scope of MG&V
- CONTENT**
- New technique or theory
  - New application of known concepts
  - Confirmation of known techniques
  - Repetition of known material
  - Too speculative or theoretical
  - Too technical
  - Too preliminary
- CONCLUSIONS DRAWN**
- Adequate
  - Not justified
  - Suffer from substantial omissions
  - Suffer from loose generalisations
- PRESENTATION**
- Adequate
  - Too brief for clarity
  - Too comprehensive, should be shortened
  - General organisation unsuitable
  - Badly written, hardly readable
  - Contains irrelevant material
- LANGUAGE**
- Satisfactory
  - Needs corrections
  - Needs substantial revision or rewriting
- ABSTRACT**
- Clear and adequate
  - Should be rewritten (or missing)
- ILLUSTRATIONS**
- Adequate
  - Inadequate technical quality
  - Not very informative
- Some may be omitted: .....
- More should be added (see Sec. IV)
- TABLES**
- Adequate
  - Should be rearranged to improve clarity
  - Some may be omitted: .....
  - More should be added (see Sec. IV)
- ABBREVIATIONS, FORMULAE, UNITS**
- Conform to accepted norms
  - Should be changed
  - Should be explained
- LITERATURE REFERENCES**
- Adequate
  - Inadequate
  - Some may be omitted: .....
  - More should be added (see Sec. IV)
- OVERALL EVALUATION**
- Excellent
  - Good
  - Acceptable
  - Poor
  - Sound, but dull
  - Without obvious significance
- FINAL RECOMMENDATION**
- Accept with no changes
  - Accept after minor revisions (without 2nd review)
  - Revise and resubmit
  - Reject

**IV. DETAILED COMMENTS**  
[THIS PART WILL BE SENT TO AUTHOR(S)]

Please typewrite or print your comments and suggestions regarding the paper. Particular attention should be given to details that may guide possible revisions or explain reasons for rejection. Feel free to continue, using extra sheets if necessary. Comments and suggestions for the Authors can also be made in the form of a scan of remarks readably hand-written in a copy of the paper.