### **Computer Optics**

#### **EVALUATION REPORT**

| Ι. | Re | <u>leva</u> | nce | to | <u>the</u> | J | our | <u>nal</u> | SCO | <u>pe</u> |
|----|----|-------------|-----|----|------------|---|-----|------------|-----|-----------|
|    |    |             |     |    |            |   |     |            |     |           |

| Diffractive optics, information optical technologies |  |
|--|--|
| Image processing, pattern recognition                |  |
| Numerical methods and data analysis                  |  |
| Outside the journal's scope                          |  |

# 2. Assessment of the level of scientific research

#### 2.1. Novelty and originality of methods and/or results

| 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

#### 3.1. Experimental research

| J | .1. Experimental research           |  |
|---|-------------------------------------|--|
| 1 | Purely theoretical work             |  |
| , | Sufficient                          |  |
| 1 | More research needs to be conducted |  |
|   | Totally insufficient                |  |

### 3.2. Clarity of presentation

| 5.2. Clarity of presentation |  |  |  |
|------------------------------|--|--|--|
| Easily readable              |  |  |  |
| Fairly clear                 |  |  |  |
| Difficult to understand      |  |  |  |
| Unintelligible               |  |  |  |

# 3.3. Size and completeness of the annotation, the correctness of the keywords and their relevance to the article

| Excellent    |  |
|--------------|--|
| Good         |  |
| Satisfactory |  |
| Poor         |  |

#### **General recommendations**

| Recommend for publication                      |  |
|--|--|
| Recommend for publication after minor revision |  |
| Major revision and extra review required       |  |
| Not recommend for publication                  |  |

**Comments** (detailed justification of assessment)