# Paper evaluation form

Evaluate the next claims on the five-point-scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation criterion</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Rather no than yes</th>
<th>More or less</th>
<th>Rather yes than no</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The paper is well readable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language used in the paper is correct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The paper is logical and well structured</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The general typeset of the paper is correct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The paper was interesting to read</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The paper gives a good overview of the topic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The material in the paper is mathematically correct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>References to the external sources are presented correctly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All the relevant references are present</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The formulae are typed correctly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Answer the following questions in free text.

1. How to evaluate the selection of the topic?
   
   This is a very practical and interesting topic, which needs to consider rational issues. The topic itself is sort of a tough and challenge one.

2. How to evaluate general presentation style?
   
   The author understands the references well, and organizes the content to an easily understandable form. It might be better if the author write an abstract of this paper.

3. How to evaluate the selection of the information given in the paper?
   
   The author summarizes a basic method and its two improvement calculation methods. Each one is well explained. However, if the author presents more basic methods, it would impress the reader more.
4. How to evaluate typesetting of the paper?
   General speaking, the typesetting is good. However, Figure 3 takes too much space.

5. What was new and interesting to me in the paper?
   The author modified calculation method proposed by other ones, and the organization of contents impresses me a lot.

6. What else would I have liked to read?
   I want to read something about how to form an attack tree in detail.

Please refer to specific shortcomings.

1. The paper has the following misprints:
   No

2. The paper has the following mistakes in wording and style:
   No

3. The paper has the following mathematical mistakes:
   No

4. The paper has the following mistakes in typesetting:
   No abstract section.

5. The paper will be more readable if the author makes the following changes:
   It would be better if the author add an abstract at the beginning of the paper.

6. The paper misses the following elements (topics, references, figures, proof steps, etc.):
   No

7. The following elements could be removed from the paper:
   No

8. Other comments:
   No