**Evaluation form for referees**

**Date of report:** 

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Please summarise your assessment of the paper:** |  | Yes | Maybe | No |
| Does the paper contain enough new material to warrant publication? |  |  |  |  |
| Is the paper scientifically sound and not misleading? |  |  |  |  |
| Does the paper include a sufficiently general introduction? |  |  |  |  |
| Is the paper clearly written, concise and understandable? |  |  |  |  |
| Are the subject matter and style of presentation appropriate for Web of Conferences? |  |  |  |  |
| Is the length (min 3 pages) appropriate? |  |  |  |  |
| Should the English writing be improved? |  |  |  |  |
| Is the impact of this paper likely to be high? |  |  |  |  |
| Does the paper include timely, accurate and relevant references? |  |  |  |  |
| Do the abstract and title present key information about the subject? |  |  |  |  |

**Please evaluate the quality of the research:**

 Excellent  
 Good  
 Average  
 Marginal  
 Poor

**Referee’s recommendation (check one, please give detailed reasons below)**

Acceptable without revision. Please give detailed reasons in the box below  
Acceptable after the authors have considered the optional revisions mentioned in the report  
Acceptable after the authors have made the revisions mentioned in the report  
  
Rejected because the scientific content does not correspond to the WOC standards/scope  
Rejected because it contains basic errors  
Rejected because it is more suitable for another journal

**Confidential comments to the editor, suggestions for alternative referees**

**Detailed scientific report to be communicated to the author(s)**

**If revisions are required, do you wish to review the revised version?**  YES  NO

Any other comments:

***Thank you for your time and care. Your contribution is greatly appreciated. Please tell us if we can improve the review experience for referees.***