

Review: Test paper

[1. Request](#)[2. Guidelines](#)[3. Download & Review](#)[4. Completion](#)

Review Files

[Q Search](#)

No Files

Reviewer Guidelines

[Review Guidelines](#)

Review Form since 2026.04.27

This review form for the *Machine Graphics & Vision* journal is intended to ensure a rigorous, consistent, and high-quality peer review process.

Reviewers are required to complete **all sections of this form in full**, providing clear, precise, and well-justified evaluations for each item. All ratings, multiple-choice selections, and open-ended responses must be addressed.

Reviews that are incomplete, lack sufficient justification, or do not engage with all required criteria may be returned for revision at the discretion of the Editorial Office.

Overall paper evaluation *

According to you, what is the overall paper evaluation?

- Very Poor
- Poor
- Average
- Good
- Outstanding

Paper Originality *

- Very poor
- Poor
- Average
- Good

Outstanding

Significance to the field *

Very Poor

Poor

Average

Good

Outstanding

Methodological soundness *

Very poor

Poor

Average

Good

Outstanding

Quality of experiments *

Very poor

Poor

Average

Good

Outstanding

Clarity of presentation *

Very poor

Poor

Average

Good

Outstanding

Summarize the content of the paper *

Is the paper content within the scope of the Machine Graphics & Vision Journal? If not, provide justification.

*

Does the paper introduce novel knowledge or methodology? *

- No clear novelty
- Limited contribution
- Yes, moderate contribution
- Yes, significant contribution

Type of contribution (select all that apply): *

- New algorithm / model
- Improvement of existing method
- New dataset
- New evaluation metric / protocol
- Benchmark / empirical study
- Theoretical contribution
- Other
- No significant contribution

What are the main strengths of the paper? *

What are the main weaknesses? *

Is the method described in sufficient detail to allow reproduction? If not, what is missing?

*

Are the experiments adequate to support the claims? If not, what additional experiments are needed?

*

Does the paper properly position itself within existing literature? Are important works missing (if yes, give examples)?

*

Are any of the literature positions ones you authored? If yes, which ones? (confidential information not transferred to the authors)

*

Are the results convincing and statistically supported? If not, summarize why. *

Is there any indication that generative AI may have replaced substantive intellectual contribution of the authors?

*

- Likely
- Possibly
- No

Does the manuscript reflect clear human oversight and responsibility for the main contributions?

*

- Yes
- No
- Unclear

Level of concern regarding AI-generated text *

- None
- Low
- Moderate
- High

Observed AI-generated content indicators (select all that apply): *

- Generic or templated academic phrasing
- Inconsistent terminology or style

- Shallow or non-specific technical explanations
- Redundant or verbose passages without added value
- Fabricated, unverifiable, or irrelevant references
- Citation patterns inconsistent with the field
- Logical inconsistencies or contradictions
- Mismatch between figures/results and descriptions
- Other
- None

If any indicators of AI-generated content were selected, give examples, otherwise type N/A

*

Are there signs of hallucinated or non-existent content (methods, datasets, citations)?

*

- No
- Possible
- Likely

Is there any indication that figures/images were generated or altered using AI tools? *

- No
- Yes (clearly disclosed)
- Yes (not disclosed)
- Unclear

If AI-generated visual content is suspected, is its use: *

- Appropriate and scientifically justified
- Questionable
- Inappropriate or misleading

Based on your assessment, does the manuscript comply with publisher AI policies? *

- Non-compliant

- Major concerns
- Minor concerns
- Fully compliant

Reviewer confidence in this assessment:

- Low
- Medium
- High

Comments to the Editor (Required if concerns exist, otherwise type N/A) *

Quality of input data (images) *

- Very poor
- Poor
- Average
- Good
- Outstanding

Dataset relevance to the problem *

- Very poor
- Poor
- Average
- Good
- Outstanding

Are the datasets: *

- Public and well-documented
- Public but insufficiently described
- Private / unavailable

Is dataset preprocessing clearly described? *

- Yes
- Partially
- No

Are annotations (labels) reliable and well-defined? *

- Yes
- Partially
- No

Select all problems addressed by the paper, relevant to the content *

- Dataset bias
- Class imbalance
- Domain shift / generalization

Indicate the problems the paper should address, but that are not present in the analysis:

*

- Dataset bias
- Class imbalance
- Domain shift / generalization
- All relevant problems are addressed

Are visual results (figures, qualitative comparisons) clear and informative? *

- No
- Partially
- Yes

Are image manipulations (augmentation, filtering, synthesis) appropriate and justified?

*

- No
- Partially
- Yes

Comments on image/data usage

(e.g., data quality, annotation issues, representativeness)

Are experiments reproducible based on the provided details? *

- No
- Partially
- Yes

Is code available? *

- Available
- Not available
- Promised

Are data available? *

- Available
- Not available
- Partial

Are evaluation metrics appropriate? *

- Yes
- Partially
- No

Grade mathematical correctness *

- Very poor
- Poor
- Average
- Good
- Outstanding

Grade soundness of experimental design *

- Very poor
- Poor
- Average
- Good
- Outstanding

Grade quality of analysis *

- Very poor
- Poor
- Average
- Good
- Outstanding

Are there ethical concerns related to the data or method? *

If not, type N/A

Does the work address potential societal risks or misuse? *

If not relevant, type N/A

Does the paper discuss fairness, bias, or transparency? *

- Yes
- Partially
- No

N/A

Grade language correctness. *

- Requires significant language revision
- Contains some errors and needs to be revised
- Minor errors
- Correct

If language corrections are needed, please give examples (if not, type in N/A) *

What specific changes are required to make this paper publishable? *

Confidential Comments to the Editor (optional)

Upload

Upload files you would like the editor and/or author to consult, including revised versions of the original review file(s).

Reviewer Files

[Q Search](#)

[Upload File](#)

No Files

Review Discussions

[Add discussion](#)

Name	From	Last Reply	Replies	Closed
------	------	------------	---------	--------

No Items

Recommendation

Select a recommendation and submit the review to complete the process. You must enter a review or upload a file before selecting a recommendation.

Choose One

[Submit Review](#)[Save for Later](#)[Go Back](#)

* Denotes required field