## 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>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language used in the paper is correct</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The paper is logical and well structured</td>
<td>1</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>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The paper was interesting to read</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The paper gives a good overview of the topic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The material in the paper is mathematically correct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</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>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Answer the following questions in free text.

1. **How to evaluate the selection of the topic?**

   The area of the author should be hash computation. However, in my opinion, the topic of this paper is not explicitly related with hash computation.

2. **How to evaluate general presentation style?**

   The general presentation style is not very good. There are a lot of very long sentences, which make the sentences hard to be understood. The relation between sentences is not explicit. In some sentences, the omission of some words makes the meaning unclear.

3. **How to evaluate the selection of the information given in the paper?**
This paper is not self inclusive, it is hard to understand the three reduction forms for a learner.

4. How to evaluate typesetting of the paper?

In general, the typesetting is fine. However, in my opinion, the space between lines is too wide, and the size of the characters is a little too big, too.

5. What was new and interesting to me in the paper?

The three reduction forms are new to me.

6. What else would I have liked to read?

Although the text is enough to express what the author want to talk about, it would be better to add some graphs while explaining the reduction forms. On the other hand, I am interested in how to implement these forms, maybe the author can give us some examples.

Please refer to specific shortcomings.

1. The paper has the following misprints:

On page 4, last 3rd line, “interesed” should be “interested”.

2. The paper has the following mistakes in wording and style:

Too many long sentences, the combination of subordinate clauses makes the meaning unclear. The author uses too many “certain” and “one”.

3. The paper has the following mathematical mistakes:

None.

4. The paper has the following mistakes in typesetting:

The “lim” expression in page three should be typed as “\limits_{x \to \infty}” in latex.

5. The paper will be more readable if the author makes the following changes:

If the author can separate the long sentences into short ones, and add more conjunctions between sentences and paragraphs, the paper would be more readable.
6. The paper misses the following elements (topics, references, figures, proof steps, etc.):

The paper misses figures, the abstract section, and the introduction of the paper's content and structure in introduction section.

7. The following elements could be removed from the paper:

None.

8. Other comments:

None.