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**EVALUATION REPORT**

*1. Relevance to the Journal scope*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Purely theoretical work |  |
| Sufficient |  |
| More research needs to be conducted |  |
| Totally insufficient |  |

3.2. 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)*