

**Review of an article submitted for publication in the publishing house
Archive of Photogrammetry, Cartography and Remote Sensing (APCRS)**

Academic title, name and surname of the reviewer:

Title of the article:

Author of the article:

Instructions for the reviewer:

1. The article review is anonymous.
2. The publisher publishes only original articles (not published before), with a scope of content consistent with the publisher's profile.
3. Both the description of own research and the monographic study are considered scientific publications.
4. In the form, for each element of the review, please provide a rating on a scale of 0 ÷ 5 points.
5. Any spelling/stylistic/punctuation errors noticed should be corrected in red directly in the article.
6. Please indicate suggested corrections/changes by inserting a comment or directly in the text (in red), or formulate them in the comments (point 2 of the review).
7. In order to ensure a high scientific level of the Archive of Photogrammetry, Cartography and Remote Sensing publishing house, papers that receive a review with a rating of over 20 points should be qualified for publication.
8. Please send the review along with the article containing any suggestions for corrections/changes to the address of the APCRS Editorial Office.
9. The editor of the issue will forward the article to the author with a request to immediately make corrections/changes in accordance with the review.

1. Review form

Assessment of the scientific value of the article	Rating (max 20)
Significance of the topic for the fields of photogrammetry, cartography, remote sensing and GIS	
Originality/innovation of the presented problem/solution	
For articles presenting own research	
Selection of applied research methods/tools	
Scientific value/significance of presented results	
For articles constituting a monographic study	
Selection of source studies (completeness, timeliness, level and importance for the presented topic)	
Quality of presentation of the topic (communicativeness, ability to synthesize, own comments and generalizations, own assessment and reference to other problems or the current state)	
Assessment of a scientific text in terms of language and editorial	Rating (max 10)
Linguistic and stylistic level of the article	
Editorial quality of the text Total (max 30 points)	
Total rating (max 30)	

2. Justification, remarks, comments:

.

3. Please indicate errors or inaccuracies in terminology:

4. Final evaluation and qualification of the article for publication in the Archive of Photogrammetry, Cartography and Remote Sensing:

I rate the reviewed article at points (on a scale of 0 ÷ 30) and propose:

- Accept in the version sent for review (yes/no?)
(this conclusion also includes the case when the Reviewer introduces noticed, obvious, minor corrections that do not require consultation with the Author)
- Accept after taking into account corrections/changes (yes?)

(The Reviewer has comments that require correction by the Author, which can be implemented within a short time. He describes the nature of these comments and refers the text for correction). The reviewer clearly states:

- I wish to receive the corrected text again (yes?)
 - I do not see the need to view the corrected text (yes?)
- Do not accept (yes?)

(The reviewer has comments that disqualify the article, or those whose introduction would mean significant re-editing of the text and as such would have to last longer than a few days. This conclusion also includes articles that are not in line with the publisher's profile.).

for publication in the Archive of Photogrammetry, Cartography and Remote Sensing publishing house.

Date:

Reviewer's Signature: