

A review of a publication by The Witelon State University of Applied Sciences in Legnica

The title of the publication

I hereby declare that*:

- a) I am not familiar with the identity of the Author of the reviewed publication or affiliation,
- b) I am familiar with the identity of the Author of the reviewed publication and his affiliation, but there fails to arise any conflict of interests between us:
(a conflict of interests should be understood as direct personal relations between the reviewer and the author (first or second degree consanguinity, legal relationships, marriage), professional subordination or direct scientific cooperation over the past 2 years prior to the year of the issuance of the review).

1. General value of the work*:

- a) it is original
- b) it makes a contribution to the development of science or applications
- c) it does not contain any new pieces of information
- d) it fails to meet the profile of a scientific journal

2. Is the title of the work convergent with its content?*

- a) yes
- b) partly, comments made by the reviewer should be taken into account
- c) no, because

3. Is the introduction convergent with and adequate to the subjects of research?*

- a) yes
- b) it requires some alterations or further elaboration
- c) no, because

4. The research material and methods applied are*:

- a) sufficient
- b) insufficient because
- c) adequately selected and described
- d) inadequately described and they require further elaboration
- e) inadequate because

5. The analysis and interpretation of the results are*:

- a) correct
- b) acceptable in the view of the comments made by the reviewer
- c) inadequate because

6. The analysis of statistical data is*:

- a) sufficient
- b) insufficient, but acceptable in the view of the comments made by the reviewer
- c) not included (it is indispensable)
- d) not required

7. The illustrations*:

- a) are of the right quantity and quality
- b) the quality of illustration no: is inadequate
- c) need improving
- d) are inadequate because
- e) are not required

8. Tables and drawings*:

- a) are suitable
- b) require alterations: tables no:, drawings no:
- c) unsuitable or insufficient
- d) are not required

9. The mathematical formulae*:

- a) are correct
- b) require some alterations, no.....
- c) incorrect because
- d) does not concern

10. The literary sources*:

- a) are adequate, taking into account the latest Polish and foreign sources
- b) are quoted in a way which fails to respect the relevant guidelines for authors

- c) are incomplete, some major sources have been omitted
- d) have been inadequately selected

11. The quotations contained in the work*:

- a) are convergent with the list of sources provided and vice versa
- b) the list of the sources provided is incomplete or longer than the number of quotations contained

12. The units of measure applied*

- a) meet the requirements of the Editorial Staff (SI system)
- b) fail to meet the above mentioned requirements

13. The conclusions or summary are*:

- a) suitable
- b) acceptable in the view of the comments made by the reviewer
- c) unsuitable (e.g. the results have been repeated)

14. The summary and key words*:

- a) are suitable
- b) fail to reflect the gist of the work – they require some minor alterations
- c) require major alterations

15. The language and spelling*:

- a) are correct
- b) require minor correction
- c) require major correction

16. The final conclusion*:

- a) the work can be accepted in its present form
- b) the work can be accepted following some minor editing alterations
- c) the work can be accepted following some essential factual alterations
- d) the work can be accepted following its complete reorganization and re-reviewing
- e) the work fails to constitute material suitable for publication.

Detailed comments:

.....
.....
.....

Date:

.....
Reviewer's signature**

* - Please underline the correct answers.

** - If the Review is to be e-mailed, the sender's address identical with the reviewer's outbox will be considered as the signature.