## *Comments to the Author(s) of the Paper*

Manuscript ID:

Title of paper:

Date of review:

**1. Recommendation**

Please insert X within [ ]

**[ ] Accept as is**:

In Section 4, the reviewer gives a few lines why the paper is accepted.

**[ ] Accept with minor revisions:** A review of the revised version is not necessary.

In Section 4, the reviewer lists minor modifications such as corrections of typos, missing references, etc.

**[ ] A major revision of the paper is required:** The revised version will be reviewed by at least one reviewer of the original version.

In Section 4, the reviewer lists the proposed changes.

**[ ] Reject:**

In Section 4, the reviewer states the reasons for the rejection of the paper.

**2. Evaluation Scale**

Please assess the paper using the following criteria:

The reviewer evaluates the scientific contribution or other general merits of the submission on a scale of 0 to 10 (0= reject under all circumstances, 5 very doubtful acceptance, 10= excellent, accept under all circumstances). To be accepted, papers must have an average of at least close to 6.

0 = absolute reject

1 = very strong recommendation to reject

2 = very weak paper, strong recommendation to reject

3= weak paper, recommendation to reject

4= recommend rejection, but can live with acceptance if grade-average is 6 or higher

5= doubtful accept, suggest to accept only if there are clearly better votes by others

6= accept this paper, it is ok, but not ground breaking

7= accept this very solid paper

8 =strong recommendation to accept this paper

9= very strong recommendation to accept, paper contains very good material

10= absolute accept

Note that all grades 5-10 are acceptances, but all are subject to minor revisions that may be required. If major revisions are required to make the paper acceptable, grade 4 or less is assigned.

**Score (enter a value between 0 and 10):**

**3. Assessment:**

a) Originality, novelty and significance of results?

[ ] Excellent

[ ] Good

[ ] Adequate

[ ] Inadequate

### b) Technical quality of the work?

[ ] Excellent

[ ] Good

[ ] Adequate

[ ] Inadequate

c) Comprehensibility and presentation of the paper?

[ ] Excellent

[ ] Good

[ ] Adequate

[ ] Inadequate

d) What is the overall impression given by the paper?

[ ] Excellent

[ ] Good

[ ] Adequate

[ ] Inadequate

e) Do the authors show awareness of work that has been published recently in International Journal of Industrial Engineering and Management?

[ ] Yes

[ ] No

**4. Comments to the Author**

**This is compulsory for all the recommendations.**

**5. Comments to the Editor-in-Chief**

This is not visible to Author(s) of the Paper.