EVALUATION REPORT

for manuscript

Diffractive optics, information optical technologies Hyperspectral data analysis Image processing, pattern recognition Numerical methods and data analysis The manuscript is inappropriate for the Journal √ Scope Satisfactory Poor Satisfactory Satisfactory Poor Satisfactory Poor Satisfactory Satisf
Good Satisfactory Poor
Satisfactory Poor
Poor
Scope
Scope 2. Assessment of the level of scientific research 2.1. Novelty and originality of methods and/or results Excellent Good Satisfactory Poor
2. Assessment of the level of scientific research 2. 1. Novelty and originality of methods and/or results Entirely novel results New ideas introduced Existing results improved Known results 2. Validity of the work and of the results obtained Entirely valid No appreciable errors Minor errors Major errors 2.3. Significance of the work Of interest to a wide scientific community Useful Of limited interest Of little interest 2.4. References to the previous related research, especially to the articles in Web of Science Excellent Good Satisfactory Poor 4. Compliance of the manuscript with the style guide-lines for authors Interior of mandatory article sections: Abstract, Key words, List of References, Authors' information. Entirely valid Minor errors Absolutely incorrect 4.2. Correctness of citation Entirely valid Minor errors Major errors Absolutely incorrect 4.2. Correctness of citation Entirely valid Minor errors Major errors Absolutely incorrect 3. Manuscript's evaluation and general impression 3. Manuscript's evaluation and general impression
2.1. Novelty and originality of methods and/or results Entirely novel results New ideas introduced Existing results improved Known results 2.2. Validity of the work and of the results obtained Entirely valid No appreciable errors Minor errors Major errors 2.3. Significance of the work Of interest to a wide scientific community Useful Of limited interest Of little interest 2.4. References to the previous related research, especially to the articles in Web of Science Excellent review Sufficient Insufficient Lacking key references 3. Manuscript's evaluation and general impression 2. I. Experimental recearch Satisfactory Poor 4. Compliance of the manuscript with the style guide-lines for authors Interproved Satisfactory Poor 4. Compliance of the manuscript with the style guide-lines for authors Interproved with the style guide-lines for authors Abstract, Key words, List of References, Authors' information. Entirely valid Minor errors Absolutely incorrect 4.2. Correctness of citation Entirely valid Minor errors Absolutely incorrect Absolutely incorrect Absolutely incorrect
Entirely novel results New ideas introduced Existing results improved Known results 2.2. Validity of the work and of the results obtained Entirely valid No appreciable errors Minor errors Major errors 2.3. Significance of the work Of interest to a wide scientific community Useful Of limited interest Of little interest 2.4. References to the previous related research, especially to the articles in Web of Science Excellent review Sufficient Insufficient Lacking key references 3. Manuscript's evaluation and general impression 2. I. Everginental preparely agreeds Satisfactory Poor 4. Compliance of the manuscript with the style guide-lines for authors http://www.computeroptics.smr.ru/ENG/guidelines.htm 4.1. Presence of mandatory article sections: Abstract, Key words, List of References, Authors' information. Entirely valid Minor errors Absolutely incorrect 4.2. Correctness of citation Entirely valid Minor errors Major errors Absolutely incorrect 4.3. Correctness of citation Entirely valid Minor errors Absolutely incorrect 4.4. Correctness of citation Entirely valid Minor errors Absolutely incorrect 4.5. Compliance of the manuscript with the style guide-lines for authors http://www.computeroptics.smr.ru/ENG/guidelines.htm 4.6. Compliance of the manuscript with the style guide-lines for authors http://www.computeroptics.smr.ru/ENG/guidelines.htm 4.6. Compliance of the manuscript with the style guide-lines for authors http://www.computeroptics.smr.ru/ENG/guidelines.htm 4.1. Presence of mandatory article sections: Abstract, Key words, List of References, Authors' information. Entirely valid Minor errors Absolutely incorrect 4.2. Correctness of citation Entirely valid Minor errors Absolutely incorrect
New ideas introduced Existing results improved Known results 2.2. Validity of the work and of the results obtained Entirely valid No appreciable errors Major errors 2.3. Significance of the work Of interest to a wide scientific community Useful Of limited interest Of little interest 2.4. References to the previous related research, especially to the articles in Web of Science Excellent review Sufficient Insufficient Lacking key references 3. Manuscript's evaluation and general impression 2.1. Engaginental research
Existing results improved Known results 2.2. Validity of the work and of the results obtained Entirely valid No appreciable errors Major errors Major errors 2.3. Significance of the work Of interest to a wide scientific community Useful Of limited interest Of little interest 2.4. References to the previous related research, especially to the articles in Web of Science Excellent review Sufficient Insufficient Lacking key references 3. Manuscript's evaluation and general impression 2.1. Experimental research
Compliance of the manuscript with the style guide-lines for authors
2.2. Validity of the work and of the results obtained Entirely valid No appreciable errors Minor errors Major errors 2.3. Significance of the work Of interest to a wide scientific community Useful Of limited interest Of little interest 2.4. References to the previous related research, especially to the articles in Web of Science Excellent review Sufficient Insufficient Lacking key references 3. Manuscript's evaluation and general impression 2.1. Experimental receasesh
Lines for authors http://www.computeroptics.smr.rw/ENG/guidelines.htm
Entirely valid No appreciable errors Minor errors Major errors 2.3. Significance of the work Of interest to a wide scientific community Useful Of limited interest Of little interest 2.4. References to the previous related research, especially to the articles in Web of Science Excellent review Sufficient Lacking key references 3. Manuscript's evaluation and general impression 1. Everyimental recorrels Authors' information. Entirely valid Minor errors Absolutely incorrect A.2. Correctness of citation Entirely valid Minor errors Major errors Major errors Major errors Major errors Absolutely incorrect Absolutely incor
Entirely valid No appreciable errors Minor errors Major errors
Minor errors Major errors 2.3. Significance of the work Of interest to a wide scientific community Useful Of limited interest 2.4. References to the previous related research, especially to the articles in Web of Science Excellent review Sufficient Insufficient Lacking key references 3. Manuscript's evaluation and general impression 2.1. Experimental research
Major errors 2.3. Significance of the work Of interest to a wide scientific community Useful Of limited interest 2.4. References to the previous related research, especially to the articles in Web of Science Excellent review Sufficient Insufficient Lacking key references 3. Manuscript's evaluation and general impression 2.1. Experimental research
2.3. Significance of the work Of interest to a wide scientific community Useful Of limited interest Of little interest 2.4. References to the previous related research, especially to the articles in Web of Science Excellent review Sufficient Insufficient Lacking key references 3. Manuscript's evaluation and general impression 2.1. Experimental research
2.3. Significance of the work Of interest to a wide scientific community Useful Of limited interest 2.4. References to the previous related research, especially to the articles in Web of Science Excellent review Sufficient Insufficient Lacking key references 3. Manuscript's evaluation and general impression 2.1. Even reimental research
Of interest to a wide scientific community Useful Of limited interest Of little interest 2.4. References to the previous related research, especially to the articles in Web of Science Excellent review Sufficient Insufficient Lacking key references 3. Manuscript's evaluation and general impression 3. In Experimental research
Useful Of limited interest Of little interest 2.4. References to the previous related research, especially to the articles in Web of Science Excellent review Sufficient Insufficient Lacking key references 3. Manuscript's evaluation and general impression 3. 1. Experimental research
Of limited interest Of little interest 2.4. References to the previous related research, especially to the articles in Web of Science Excellent review Sufficient Insufficient Lacking key references 3. Manuscript's evaluation and general impression 3. In Experimental research
Of little interest 2.4. References to the previous related research, especially to the articles in Web of Science Excellent review Sufficient Lacking key references 3. Manuscript's evaluation and general impression 3. 1. Experimental research
2.4. References to the previous related research, especially to the articles in Web of Science Excellent review Sufficient Insufficient Lacking key references 3. Manuscript's evaluation and general impression 3. 1. Experimental research
2.4. References to the previous related research, especially to the articles in Web of Science Excellent review Sufficient Insufficient Lacking key references 3. Manuscript's evaluation and general impression 3. 1. Experimental research
cially to the articles in Web of Science Excellent review Sufficient Insufficient Lacking key references 3. Manuscript's evaluation and general impression 3. 1. Experimental research
Excellent review Sufficient Insufficient Lacking key references 3. Manuscript's evaluation and general impression 3. 1. Experimental research
Sufficient Insufficient Lacking key references 3. Manuscript's evaluation and general impression 3. 1. Experimental research
Insufficient Lacking key references 3. Manuscript's evaluation and general impression 3. 1. Experimental research
Lacking key references 3. Manuscript's evaluation and general impression 3. 1. Experimental research
3. Manuscript's evaluation and general impression 3. 1. Experimental research
2.1 Everymental receptab
2.1 Everymental receptab
3.1 Experimental research
Purely theoretical work Recommend for publication
Sufficient Description of the second of the
More research needs to be conducted Recommend for publication once reviewer's
Totally insufficient comments have been addressed Essential revision and extra review required
3.2. Clarity of presentation Not recommend for publication
Easily readable
Fairly clear
Difficult to understand Unintelligible

Comments