

**Title of the manuscript:**

**PART I. Comments of the Reviewer**

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>
Do you find the employed terminology proper and the layout of the text correct?		
Are tables and figures properly drawn up?		
Do you think that the paper title corresponds to its content?		
Do you think that the aims are formulated comprehensibly?		
Do the author(s) state comprehensibly what they have achieved?		
Does the article include new and original issues/material?		
May the article find its application?		
Do you find the bibliography representative and contemporary?		

**PART II. Specific comments**

<b>The row's number</b>	<b>Notes</b>

**PART III. Conclusion (choose only one)**

	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>
The article is suitable for publication in its current form.		
The article is suitable for publication after considering reviewer's observations.		
The revised version should be given to re-review.		
The article is not suitable for publication.		

**PART IV. Is the scope of the manuscript within the scientific specialisation of the reviewer?**

- within the same scope*                       *very close*                       *far from the scope*

**PART V. The overall evaluation of manuscript in reference to papers representing the same research field, issued today**

- excellent – lays within 25% of the best publications issued recently*  
 *very good – lays within 50% of the best publications*  
 *average – is not worse than other related publications recently published*  
 *lower than average – is worse than other related publications recently published*

**PART VI. For the Conference Organisers' information only:**

.....  
.....

**PART VII. Reviewer (scientific title, name and surname, work place, email):**

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

*\* I declare that there is no conflict of interest between me and the authors of this manuscript.*

.....  
.....  
*Review date*

*Signature*