

---

**MM Science Journal - reviews of your scientific paper**

6 pesan

---

**Nikola Matolínová** <nikola.matolinova@mmscience.eu>  
Kepada: Helmy Purwanto <helmypurwanto@unwahas.ac.id>

6 Oktober 2021 16.04

Dear Mr. Helmy Purwanto,

I am very pleased to inform you that both of the reviews just arrived in our redaction, please see them attached.

Now I would like to kindly ask you to check them up and reflect on the comments of both reviewers in the content of your scientific paper. One of the reviewers (nr. 2121) has had some objections and has evaluated your paper with a slightly lower score and would request some major revisions before publishing the paper.

In order to follow our review process, your paper needs to be sent to this reviewer after revisions for final approval.

When you edit your paper please send it back to me, I will proceed with it further.

Thank you very much for your cooperation and I wish you a nice day.

Best regards,

Nikola Matolinova

MM Science Journal

---

*Ing. Nikola Matolínová, MIM*

*MM Science Journal, MM publishing, s.r.o.*

*Přípotoční, 151910A, 101 00 Praha 10*

*tel.: +420 775 245 809*

[nikola.matolinova@mmscience.eu](mailto:nikola.matolinova@mmscience.eu)

---

**2 lampiran**

 **DONE\_4\_MM-SJ\_RevForm\_NoReviewer\_1917\_NoPaper\_2021119.pdf**  
1807K

 **DONE\_4\_MM-SJ\_RevForm\_NoReviewer\_2121\_NoPaper\_2021119.pdf**  
1886K

---

**Helmy Purwanto** <helmypurwanto@unwahas.ac.id>  
Kepada: Nikola Matolínová <nikola.matolinova@mmscience.eu>

12 Oktober 2021 20.40

Dear Ms. Nikola Matolinova

Healthy greetings, here we re-submit the article that we have revised according to the feedback and corrections from the reviewers.

Thank you for your help and cooperation.

Best Regards

Helmy Purwanto  
[Kutipan teks disembunyikan]

---

## 2 lampiran

 **DEEP CRYOGENIC\_HELMY PURWANTO\_MM SCEINCE FORMATED\_REVISION.doc**  
2489K

 **DEEP CRYOGENIC\_HELMY PURWANTO\_MM SCEINCE FORMATED\_REVISION.pdf**  
444K

---

**Nikola Matolínová** <nikola.matolinova@mmscience.eu>  
Kepada: Helmy Purwanto <helmypurwanto@unwahas.ac.id>

11 November 2021 16.33

Dear Mr. Helmy Purwanto,

I am pleased to inform you, that the revised version of your paper has passed the review process and can be published in the next issue of the MM Science Journal. The reviewer still has some minor comments, therefore, I would like to ask you to check them up and reflect them in your paper.

When you edit your paper please send it back to me, I will proceed to the final touches before publication.

Just to inform you, the closing date for the December issue of the MMSJ is on Monday, November 22nd and I need to have the final paper in the redaction prior that date.

Thank you for your cooperation and kind regards,

Nikola Matolínová

MM Science Journal

[Kutipan teks disembunyikan]

---

 **4\_MM-SJ\_RevForm\_NoReviewer\_2121\_NoPaper\_2021119\_REVISION.PDF**  
1806K

---

**Helmy Purwanto** <helmypurwanto@unwahas.ac.id>

14 November 2021 16.51

Kepada: Nikola Matolínová <nikola.matolinova@mmscience.eu>

Dear Ms. Nikola Matolínová

Good health always,

Attached is our article which has been improved according to the suggestions and feedback from reviewers.

I have included basic statistics in the methodology and results, using the average data that we took from several tests and the standard deviation.

We have presented the microstructure in Figure 4, so we have adjusted the abstract, discussion and conclusions.

Can we immediately obtain a letter of acceptance of the article and bill of payment that we will use as a report to funders in this research.

Thank you very much, and we are very happy for the help and cooperation with MM Science Journal.

Best regards

Helmy Purwanto

[Kutipan teks disembunyikan]

---

## 2 lampiran



**DEEP CRYOGENIC\_HELMY PURWANTO\_MM SCEINCE FORMATED\_REVISION\_2.doc**  
3040K



**DEEP CRYOGENIC\_HELMY PURWANTO\_MM SCEINCE FORMATED\_REVISION\_2.pdf**  
673K

---

**Nikola Matolínová** <nikola.matolinova@mmscience.eu>  
Kepada: Helmy Purwanto <helmypurwanto@unwahas.ac.id>

15 November 2021 16.10

Dear Mr. Helmy Purwanto,

Thank you very much for sending me the final version of your scientific paper. I confirm that we will publish your paper in the December issue of the MM Science Journal which is planned for Decemer 14th, 2021. Please find attached the letter of acceptance.

Regarding the invoice, I will send it to you once your article has been published. In the meantime, can you please confirm the billing information. Can I create the invoice while using the following billing information:

**Helmy Purwato, Department of Mechanical**

**Engineering, Universitas Wahid Hasyim Jl.**

Menoreh Tengah X/22 Sampangan Semarang 50236

Indonesia

Thank you and kind regards,

[Kutipan teks disembunyikan]



**Letter of Acceptance\_MM SJ\_MrPurwanto.pdf**  
125K

---

**Helmy Purwanto** <helmypurwanto@unwahas.ac.id>  
Kepada: Nikola Matolínová <nikola.matolinova@mmscience.eu>

15 November 2021 18.29

Dear Ms. Nikola Matolínová

Thank you very much for sending the acceptance letter.

Billing invoice to:

**Helmy Purwanto**

Department of Mechanical Engineering, Universitas Wahid Hasyim  
Jl. Menoreh Tengah X/22 Sampangan Semarang 50236 Indonesia

Greetings always, Best regards

Helmy Purwanto

[Kutipan teks disembunyikan]



Helmy Purwanto &lt;helmypurwanto@unwahas.ac.id&gt;

---

## Your scientific paper has been published in MM Science Journal

2 pesan

---

**Nikola Matolínová** <nikola.matolinova@mmscience.eu>  
Kepada: Helmy Purwanto <helmypurwanto@unwahas.ac.id>

16 Desember 2021 16.36

Dear Mr. Helmy Purwanto,

I am pleased to announce that your scientific paper „THE EFFECT OF DEEP CRYOGENIC ON TENSILE STRENGTH AND IMPACT TOUGHNESS IN QUENCH TEMPERED STEEL PLATE AS A CANDIDATE FOR BALLISTIC RESISTANCE MATERIAL„ has been published in the December issue of the MM Science Journal; this issue was distributed among the readers on Wednesday, December 15, 2021.

We are very honored that you have chosen our title for your publishing activities. We believe that MM Science Journal will ensure your paper citation and pass on the results of your R&D activities to other workplaces, where it will create a link of cooperation and partnership.

I would also like to remind you that in addition to the Scopus and Ebsco databases, the MM Science Journal is indexed in the Web of Science citation database.

You can find your scientific article on the web under the following link:

<https://www.mmscience.eu/2021119>

Thank you once again for your cooperation and I wish you a Merry Xmas.

Best regards,

Nikola Matolinova

MM Science Journal

---

*Ing. Nikola Matolínová, MIM*

*MM Science Journal, MM publishing, s.r.o.*

*Přípotoční, 151910A, 101 00 Praha 10*

*tel.:+420 775 245 809*

[nikola.matolinova@mmscience.eu](mailto:nikola.matolinova@mmscience.eu)

**Helmy Purwanto** <helmypurwanto@unwahas.ac.id>  
Kepada: Nikola Matolínová <nikola.matolinova@mmscience.eu>

16 Desember 2021 19.02

Dear Ms. Nikola Matolínová

Thank you, thank you very much for being given the opportunity to publish the results of my research in MM Science. Hopefully in the future there will be more articles to be published in MM science. And soon I will pay the bill. I am very happy to work with MM Science. Hopefully all editors and reviewers are always healthy. Merry Christmas and Happy New Year.

Regards

Helmy Purwanto and Tim  
[Kutipan teks disembunyikan]

---

**article submit**

8 pesan

---

**Helmy Purwanto** <helmypurwanto@unwahas.ac.id>

24 Agustus 2021 07.21

Kepada: editorial.board@mmscience.eu

Cc: roman.dvorak@mmscience.eu, nikola.matolinova@mmscience.eu

Wish you good health always

Last year I published my article on MM Science and I was satisfied. This year, I have another article to publish.

Here we submit an article with a title "THE EFFECT OF DEEP CRYOGENIC ON TENSILE STRENGTH AND IMPACT TOUGHNESS IN QUENCH TEMPERED STEEL PLATE AS A CANDIDATE FOR BALLISTIC RESISTANCE MATERIAL"

to be published on The MM Science Journal.

I hope you get good news, Thank you for your cooperation.

Best regards

Helmy Purwanto

---

**2 lampiran****DEEP CRYOGENIC\_HELMY PURWANTO\_MM SCEINCE FORMATED\_SUBMITT.doc**  
364K**DEEP CRYOGENIC\_HELMY PURWANTO\_MM SCEINCE FORMATED\_SUBMITT.pdf**  
397K

---

**Nikola Matolínová** <nikola.matolinova@mmscience.eu>

24 Agustus 2021 15.51

Kepada: Helmy Purwanto &lt;helmypurwanto@unwahas.ac.id&gt;

Dear Mr. Purwanto,

Thank you for submitting your scientific paper to the MM Science Journal. We are pleased that you have chosen again our Journal for publication of your scientific work.

In order to start the review process, we ask international authors to pay in advance an amount of 235 Eur (no VAT included) to cover the costs of the review process and editorial costs. The total cost of the publication process in 2021 is 470 EUR.

In case you would like to continue in the review process with us, I would kindly ask you to send me the billing information.

1. Full name of the entity, full address
2. VAT No.

Once the invoice is paid, we will start the review process.

Also I would like to ask you to fill in, sign and send me the Copyright transfer declaration (see attached). It needs to be signed by all authors of the paper.

Thank you in advance and I am looking forward to our cooperation.

Have a nice rest of the day.

Kind regards,

Nikola Matolinova

MM Science Journal

[Kutipan teks disembunyikan]

---

 **CopDeclarFull\_MM-SJ.DOC**  
32K

---

**Helmy Purwanto** <helmypurwanto@unwahas.ac.id>  
Kepada: Nikola Matolínová <nikola.matolinova@mmscience.eu>

26 Agustus 2021 07.26

Dear Ms Nikola Matolinova

We agree to the terms of the MM Science journal. For billed addresses:

Name : Helmy Purwanto

Address : Department of Mechanical Engineering, Universitas Wahid Hasyim Jl. Menoreh Tengah X/22 Sampangan Semarang 50236 Indonesia

VAT ID : -

And here we send Copyright Transfer Declaration

Thank you for your help and cooperation

Best Regards,  
Helmy Purwanto

[Kutipan teks disembunyikan]

---

 **mmscience copyright Helmy Purwanto.pdf**  
381K

---

**Nikola Matolínová** <nikola.matolinova@mmscience.eu>  
Kepada: Helmy Purwanto <helmypurwanto@unwahas.ac.id>

26 Agustus 2021 17.02

Dear Mr. Helmy Purwanto,

Thank you very much for the invoicing details.

Please find attached the invoice nr. SJ0292021 for the review process in the MM Science Journal. I've also attached a confirmation of the bank account and bank address in case your bank will need it.

Thank you for your cooperation and have a nice day.

Kind regards

Nikola Matolínová

[Kutipan teks disembunyikan]

---

## 2 lampiran



**Common invoice - SJ0292021.pdf**

195K



**Confirmation of bank address.pdf**

450K

---

**Helmy Purwanto** <helmypurwanto@unwahas.ac.id>  
Kepada: Nikola Matolínová <nikola.matolinova@mmscience.eu>

27 Agustus 2021 15.02

Dear Ms. Nikola Matolínová  
Good health always,  
Here we send proof of payment according to the bill  
**Thank you for your help and cooperation**

Best Regard  
Helmy Purwanto  
[Kutipan teks disembunyikan]



**MM Science Transver\_1\_EUR.pdf**

305K

---

**Nikola Matolínová** <nikola.matolinova@mmscience.eu>  
Kepada: Helmy Purwanto <helmypurwanto@unwahas.ac.id>

30 Agustus 2021 14.35

Dear Mr. Helmy Purwanto,

Thank you very much for sending me the proof of payment. We will start the review process of your paper.  
Once I will receive both reviews from the independent reviewers, I will contact you.

Have a nice rest of the day.

With kind regards,

[Kutipan teks disembunyikan]

---

**Helmy Purwanto** <helmypurwanto@unwahas.ac.id>  
Kepada: Nikola Matolínová <nikola.matolinova@mmscience.eu>

4 Oktober 2021 08.11

Dear Ms. Nikola Matolinova  
Good morning greetings healthy always.  
Sorry, please inform the progress of my article with a title "THE EFFECT OF DEEP CRYOGENIC ON TENSILE STRENGTH AND IMPACT TOUGHNESS IN QUENCH TEMPERED STEEL PLATE AS A CANDIDATE FOR

BALLISTIC RESISTANCE MATERIAL".  
Thank you for your help and cooperation.

Best regards

Helmy Purwanto  
[Kutipan teks disembunyikan]

---

**Nikola Matolínová** <nikola.matolinova@mmscience.eu>  
Kepada: Helmy Purwanto <helmypurwanto@unwahas.ac.id>

4 Oktober 2021 16.07

Dear Mr. Helmy Purwanto,

Thank you very much for your email. In regards to your article, we are still in the middle of the review process. I have received one review and the second one should be delivered to our redaction in the middle of next week. Once I will have both reviews, I will send them to you for revisions.

Thank you for your cooperation and I wish you a very nice day.

Kind regards,

[Kutipan teks disembunyikan]

# MM-Science Journal Paper Review Form

Please complete and return this form to MM-Science Journal by clicking the 'Submit by Email' button  
by \_\_\_\_\_ at the latest

Reviewer No: \_\_\_\_\_

for the paper No: \_\_\_\_\_

**Title of the paper:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Paper's overall score (min 0; max 1):**

## Kind of the intended paper

The MM-Science Journal invites high-quality submissions on substantial, original and previously unpublished research. Applied, theoretical, results-oriented and speculative papers from both academia and industry will all be considered for inclusion. Contributions are classified into and are reviewed in the following categories:

- **Research Papers** describing contributions and the latest results of scientific work.
- **Industrial Papers** should signal industrial needs for design approaches/techniques, experiences from their implementation and use, experiences from training of engineers, demands on computer support, best practice, qualitative case studies, etc.
- **Design Education Papers** should be based on a scientific approach describing substantial new experiences based on design education training, teamwork, projects or cases.
- **Philosophy or Speculations Papers** provide a category for contributions where the author has a free hand to evolve new ideas without a claim for scientific validation. However, the paper should be rigorously related to state-of-the-art literature and clearly indicate the novelty of the ideas.

For a proper evaluation and use of correct criteria we ask you to classify:

Please select:

- [A] A research paper
- [B] An industrial paper
- [C] An educational paper
- [D] A philosophy or speculation paper

## I. How strong is the intended papers's content?

1. Indicate the intended paper's topicality and significance

Please select:

- [0 p.] Useless and/or not significant theme and/or subject
- [1 p.] Not topical and/or not significant theme and/or subject
- [2 p.] Up to date however less significant theme and/or subject
- [3 p.] Up to date and significant theme and/or subject
- [4 p.] New challenging and significant theme and/or subject

2. Indicate the intended paper's novelty and level of contribution to present knowledge

Please select:

- [0 p.] General and/or unarticulated material
- [1 p.] Repetition of known material
- [2 p.] New application of known material
- [3 p.] New theory contributions or additions
- [4 p.] Innovative contribution to theory, methods or models

3. Are the discourse and conclusions valid?

Please select:

- [0 p.] Not justified, no message
- [1 p.] Major omissions, weak justification
- [2 p.] Loose generalisations, weak polemic
- [3 p.] Good justification, reasonable discourse
- [4 p.] Strong justification, strong discourse

4. Is an industrial or application perspective reflected in a reasonable way by the author(s)?

Please select:

- [0 p.] No comments included
- [1 p.] Naive, invalid arguments
- [2 p.] Questionable reflection on industrial scope
- [3 p.] Reasonable reflection on industrial scope
- [4 p.] Strong, convincing reflection

for [A]: Are the scientific methods and reviews clearly described? Is a scientific contribution proved?

5. for [B/D]: Is the industrial reasoning from symptoms, diagnosis, and improvements to results strong?

for [C]: Does the extended abstract show good pedagogic understanding?


- |  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
| <input type="radio"/> [0 p.] No description included                                       | <input type="radio"/> [0 p.] No comments included                 | <input type="radio"/> [0 p.] No educational aspects introduced |
| <input type="radio"/> [1 p.] Poor or sparse hints to methodics                             | <input type="radio"/> [1 p.] Jump to conclusion, no justification | <input type="radio"/> [1 p.] Poor understanding                |
| <input type="radio"/> [2 p.] Questionable, insufficient description                        | <input type="radio"/> [2 p.] Major omissions, unclear reasoning   | <input type="radio"/> [2 p.] Inadequate reflections            |
| <input type="radio"/> [3 p.] Reasonable description and application of methods and reviews | <input type="radio"/> [3 p.] Reasonable thread of reasoning       | <input type="radio"/> [3 p.] Reasonable educational aspects    |
| <input type="radio"/> [4 p.] Rigour in scientific reasoning, methods and reviews           | <input type="radio"/> [4 p.] Strong, convincing reasoning         | <input type="radio"/> [4 p.] Good educational understanding    |

6. Are the references adequate and state-of-the-art?

Please select:

- [0 p.] No references
- [1 p.] Apparently only own references
- [2 p.] Less adequate references
- [3 p.] Reasonable references shown
- [4 p.] Central state-of-the-art references

Your overall score of the content strength [min 0; max 1] is:  $(\sum l.) / 24 = 0.xx =$

### Concerns and advice regarding the content strengths:

Your task as a reviewer is to advise the author(s) as to how to improve the intended paper and making it relevant for MM Science Journal. You must therefore explain to the author(s) about your concerns and give them advice.

## II. How well is the intended paper written?

1. Is the intended paper well structured and organised?

*Please select:*

- [0 p.] Inadequate structure
- [1 p.] Irrelevant material included
- [2 p.] Inadequate content/length relation
- [3 p.] Reasonable structure
- [4 p.] Good structure

2. Is the use of English satisfactory?

*Please select:*

- [0 p.] Unacceptable language, obscure terminology
- [1 p.] Extensive revision necessary
- [2 p.] Needs some revisions as indicated
- [3 p.] Acceptable
- [4 p.] Good grammar and vocabulary

3. Are the illustrations and tables clear, effective and understandable?

*Please select:*

- [0 p.] Unacceptable
- [1 p.] Major flaws, missing illustrations
- [2 p.] Partly inadequate
- [3 p.] Reasonable clear concept
- [4 p.] Complete, precise

**Your overall score of the formal qualities [min 0; max 1] is:  $(\Sigma II.) / 12 = 0.yy =$**

Instructions and advice regarding the formal qualities:

As a reviewer you should also advise the author(s) concerning the formal aspects of the intended paper. Please give your instructions and advice here.

### Review summary and recommendation

Based upon your scoring of the paper manuscript:

the content strength [min 0; max 1] is: 0,xx = \_\_\_\_\_

the formal qualities [min 0; max 1] is: 0,yy = \_\_\_\_\_

i.e. overall score [min 0; max 1] is:  $(24 \times 0,xx + 12 \times 0,yy)/36 = 0,zz =$

From it follows, that your final evaluation of the intended paper is:

0	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.5	0.6	0.7	0.8	0.9	1
not acceptable		acceptable with major revisions		acceptable with minor revisions		acceptable as it is				

In case your overall score is over 0.85 it is a must to comment and reason so high rating (paper must be really exceptionally quality to be rated by so high rating). Please, write down a few 5 sentences explaining such a high evaluation into section Comments to the MM Science Journal redaction (next page).

## Reflection

What is your competence as a referee in relation to the actual paper and topic?

*Please select:*

- I am an expert in the subject area of the paper
- I am knowledgeable in the area but not an expert
- I am not an expert; my evaluation is that of an informed outsider

Do you have comments to the MM Science Journal redaction (not to be forward to the author(s)) concerning your evaluation, the paper, your comments etc ?

Please check when ready:

- This is my final version of the review**

*Reference: McAloone T. and Andreasen M.M., DESIGN 2008 Conference Paper Review Form, Dubrovnik. Technical University of Denmark, Lyngby, Denmark, 2008*

*Your personal data are handled in accordance with the principles of new EU Regulations on the protection of personal data (GDPR).*

*In case of any questions regarding our principles connected with the protection of personal data or data contained in our filing system, please contact us: [dagmar.podolakova@mmscience.eu](mailto:dagmar.podolakova@mmscience.eu)*

# MM-Science Journal Paper Review Form

Please complete and return this form to MM-Science Journal by clicking the 'Submit by Email' button  
by \_\_\_\_\_ at the latest

Reviewer No: \_\_\_\_\_

for the paper No: \_\_\_\_\_

**Title of the paper:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Paper's overall score (min 0; max 1):**

## Kind of the intended paper

The MM-Science Journal invites high-quality submissions on substantial, original and previously unpublished research. Applied, theoretical, results-oriented and speculative papers from both academia and industry will all be considered for inclusion. Contributions are classified into and are reviewed in the following categories:

- **Research Papers** describing contributions and the latest results of scientific work.
- **Industrial Papers** should signal industrial needs for design approaches/techniques, experiences from their implementation and use, experiences from training of engineers, demands on computer support, best practice, qualitative case studies, etc.
- **Design Education Papers** should be based on a scientific approach describing substantial new experiences based on design education training, teamwork, projects or cases.
- **Philosophy or Speculations Papers** provide a category for contributions where the author has a free hand to evolve new ideas without a claim for scientific validation. However, the paper should be rigorously related to state-of-the-art literature and clearly indicate the novelty of the ideas.

For a proper evaluation and use of correct criteria we ask you to classify:

Please select:

- [A] A research paper
- [B] An industrial paper
- [C] An educational paper
- [D] A philosophy or speculation paper

## I. How strong is the intended papers's content?

1. Indicate the intended paper's topicality and significance

Please select:

- [0 p.] Useless and/or not significant theme and/or subject
- [1 p.] Not topical and/or not significant theme and/or subject
- [2 p.] Up to date however less significant theme and/or subject
- [3 p.] Up to date and significant theme and/or subject
- [4 p.] New challenging and significant theme and/or subject

2. Indicate the intended paper's novelty and level of contribution to present knowledge

Please select:

- [0 p.] General and/or unarticulated material
- [1 p.] Repetition of known material
- [2 p.] New application of known material
- [3 p.] New theory contributions or additions
- [4 p.] Innovative contribution to theory, methods or models

3. Are the discourse and conclusions valid?

Please select:

- [0 p.] Not justified, no message
- [1 p.] Major omissions, weak justification
- [2 p.] Loose generalisations, weak polemic
- [3 p.] Good justification, reasonable discourse
- [4 p.] Strong justification, strong discourse

4. Is an industrial or application perspective reflected in a reasonable way by the author(s)?

Please select:

- [0 p.] No comments included
- [1 p.] Naive, invalid arguments
- [2 p.] Questionable reflection on industrial scope
- [3 p.] Reasonable reflection on industrial scope
- [4 p.] Strong, convincing reflection

for [A]: Are the scientific methods and reviews clearly described? Is a scientific contribution proved?

5. for [B/D]: Is the industrial reasoning from symptoms, diagnosis, and improvements to results strong?

for [C]: Does the extended abstract show good pedagogic understanding?


- |  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
| <input type="radio"/> [0 p.] No description included                                       | <input type="radio"/> [0 p.] No comments included                 | <input type="radio"/> [0 p.] No educational aspects introduced |
| <input type="radio"/> [1 p.] Poor or sparse hints to methodics                             | <input type="radio"/> [1 p.] Jump to conclusion, no justification | <input type="radio"/> [1 p.] Poor understanding                |
| <input type="radio"/> [2 p.] Questionable, insufficient description                        | <input type="radio"/> [2 p.] Major omissions, unclear reasoning   | <input type="radio"/> [2 p.] Inadequate reflections            |
| <input type="radio"/> [3 p.] Reasonable description and application of methods and reviews | <input type="radio"/> [3 p.] Reasonable thread of reasoning       | <input type="radio"/> [3 p.] Reasonable educational aspects    |
| <input type="radio"/> [4 p.] Rigour in scientific reasoning, methods and reviews           | <input type="radio"/> [4 p.] Strong, convincing reasoning         | <input type="radio"/> [4 p.] Good educational understanding    |

6. Are the references adequate and state-of-the-art?

Please select:

- [0 p.] No references
- [1 p.] Apparently only own references
- [2 p.] Less adequate references
- [3 p.] Reasonable references shown
- [4 p.] Central state-of-the-art references

Your overall score of the content strength [min 0; max 1] is:  $(\sum l.) / 24 = 0.xx =$

### Concerns and advice regarding the content strengths:

Your task as a reviewer is to advise the author(s) as to how to improve the intended paper and making it relevant for MM Science Journal. You must therefore explain to the author(s) about your concerns and give them advice.

## II. How well is the intended paper written?

1. Is the intended paper well structured and organised?

*Please select:*

- [0 p.] Inadequate structure
- [1 p.] Irrelevant material included
- [2 p.] Inadequate content/length relation
- [3 p.] Reasonable structure
- [4 p.] Good structure

2. Is the use of English satisfactory?

*Please select:*

- [0 p.] Unacceptable language, obscure terminology
- [1 p.] Extensive revision necessary
- [2 p.] Needs some revisions as indicated
- [3 p.] Acceptable
- [4 p.] Good grammar and vocabulary

3. Are the illustrations and tables clear, effective and understandable?

*Please select:*

- [0 p.] Unacceptable
- [1 p.] Major flaws, missing illustrations
- [2 p.] Partly inadequate
- [3 p.] Reasonable clear concept
- [4 p.] Complete, precise

**Your overall score of the formal qualities [min 0; max 1] is:  $(\Sigma II.) / 12 = 0.yy =$**

Instructions and advice regarding the formal qualities:

As a reviewer you should also advise the author(s) concerning the formal aspects of the intended paper. Please give your instructions and advice here.

### Review summary and recommendation

Based upon your scoring of the paper manuscript:

the content strength [min 0; max 1] is: **0,xx** = \_\_\_\_\_

the formal qualities [min 0; max 1] is: **0,yy** = \_\_\_\_\_

**i.e. overall score [min 0; max 1] is:  $(24 \times 0,xx + 12 \times 0,yy)/36 = 0,zz =$**

**From it follows, that your final evaluation of the intended paper is:**

0	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.5	0.6	0.7	0.8	0.9	1
not acceptable		acceptable with major revisions		acceptable with minor revisions		acceptable as it is				

**In case your overall score is over 0.85 it is a must to comment and reason so high rating (paper must be really exceptionally quality to be rated by so high rating). Please, write down a few 5 sentences explaining such a high evaluation into section Comments to the MM Science Journal redaction (next page).**

## Reflection

What is your competence as a referee in relation to the actual paper and topic?

*Please select:*

- I am an expert in the subject area of the paper
- I am knowledgeable in the area but not an expert
- I am not an expert; my evaluation is that of an informed outsider

Do you have comments to the MM Science Journal redaction (not to be forward to the author(s)) concerning your evaluation, the paper, your comments etc ?

Please check when ready:

- This is my final version of the review**

*Reference: McAloone T. and Andreasen M.M., DESIGN 2008 Conference Paper Review Form, Dubrovnik. Technical University of Denmark, Lyngby, Denmark, 2008*

*Your personal data are handled in accordance with the principles of new EU Regulations on the protection of personal data (GDPR).*

*In case of any questions regarding our principles connected with the protection of personal data or data contained in our filing system, please contact us: [dagmar.podolakova@mmscience.eu](mailto:dagmar.podolakova@mmscience.eu)*

# MM-Science Journal Paper Review Form

Please complete and return this form to MM-Science Journal by clicking the 'Submit by Email' button  
by \_\_\_\_\_ at the latest

Reviewer No: \_\_\_\_\_

for the paper No: \_\_\_\_\_

**Title of the paper:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Paper's overall score (min 0; max 1):**

## Kind of the intended paper

The MM-Science Journal invites high-quality submissions on substantial, original and previously unpublished research. Applied, theoretical, results-oriented and speculative papers from both academia and industry will all be considered for inclusion. Contributions are classified into and are reviewed in the following categories:

- **Research Papers** describing contributions and the latest results of scientific work.
- **Industrial Papers** should signal industrial needs for design approaches/techniques, experiences from their implementation and use, experiences from training of engineers, demands on computer support, best practice, qualitative case studies, etc.
- **Design Education Papers** should be based on a scientific approach describing substantial new experiences based on design education training, teamwork, projects or cases.
- **Philosophy or Speculations Papers** provide a category for contributions where the author has a free hand to evolve new ideas without a claim for scientific validation. However, the paper should be rigorously related to state-of-the-art literature and clearly indicate the novelty of the ideas.

For a proper evaluation and use of correct criteria we ask you to classify:

Please select:

- [A] A research paper
- [B] An industrial paper
- [C] An educational paper
- [D] A philosophy or speculation paper

## I. How strong is the intended papers's content?

1. Indicate the intended paper's topicality and significance

Please select:

- [0 p.] Useless and/or not significant theme and/or subject
- [1 p.] Not topical and/or not significant theme and/or subject
- [2 p.] Up to date however less significant theme and/or subject
- [3 p.] Up to date and significant theme and/or subject
- [4 p.] New challenging and significant theme and/or subject

2. Indicate the intended paper's novelty and level of contribution to present knowledge

Please select:

- [0 p.] General and/or unarticulated material
- [1 p.] Repetition of known material
- [2 p.] New application of known material
- [3 p.] New theory contributions or additions
- [4 p.] Innovative contribution to theory, methods or models

3. Are the discourse and conclusions valid?

Please select:

- [0 p.] Not justified, no message
- [1 p.] Major omissions, weak justification
- [2 p.] Loose generalisations, weak polemic
- [3 p.] Good justification, reasonable discourse
- [4 p.] Strong justification, strong discourse

4. Is an industrial or application perspective reflected in a reasonable way by the author(s)?

Please select:

- [0 p.] No comments included
- [1 p.] Naive, invalid arguments
- [2 p.] Questionable reflection on industrial scope
- [3 p.] Reasonable reflection on industrial scope
- [4 p.] Strong, convincing reflection

for [A]: Are the scientific methods and reviews clearly described? Is a scientific contribution proved?

5. for [B/D]: Is the industrial reasoning from symptoms, diagnosis, and improvements to results strong?

for [C]: Does the extended abstract show good pedagogic understanding?


- |  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
| <input type="radio"/> [0 p.] No description included                                       | <input type="radio"/> [0 p.] No comments included                 | <input type="radio"/> [0 p.] No educational aspects introduced |
| <input type="radio"/> [1 p.] Poor or sparse hints to methodics                             | <input type="radio"/> [1 p.] Jump to conclusion, no justification | <input type="radio"/> [1 p.] Poor understanding                |
| <input type="radio"/> [2 p.] Questionable, insufficient description                        | <input type="radio"/> [2 p.] Major omissions, unclear reasoning   | <input type="radio"/> [2 p.] Inadequate reflections            |
| <input type="radio"/> [3 p.] Reasonable description and application of methods and reviews | <input type="radio"/> [3 p.] Reasonable thread of reasoning       | <input type="radio"/> [3 p.] Reasonable educational aspects    |
| <input type="radio"/> [4 p.] Rigour in scientific reasoning, methods and reviews           | <input type="radio"/> [4 p.] Strong, convincing reasoning         | <input type="radio"/> [4 p.] Good educational understanding    |

6. Are the references adequate and state-of-the-art?

Please select:

- [0 p.] No references
- [1 p.] Apparently only own references
- [2 p.] Less adequate references
- [3 p.] Reasonable references shown
- [4 p.] Central state-of-the-art references

Your overall score of the content strength [min 0; max 1] is:  $(\sum l.) / 24 = 0.xx =$

### Concerns and advice regarding the content strengths:

Your task as a reviewer is to advise the author(s) as to how to improve the intended paper and making it relevant for MM Science Journal. You must therefore explain to the author(s) about your concerns and give them advice.

## II. How well is the intended paper written?

1. Is the intended paper well structured and organised?

*Please select:*

- [0 p.] Inadequate structure
- [1 p.] Irrelevant material included
- [2 p.] Inadequate content/length relation
- [3 p.] Reasonable structure
- [4 p.] Good structure

2. Is the use of English satisfactory?

*Please select:*

- [0 p.] Unacceptable language, obscure terminology
- [1 p.] Extensive revision necessary
- [2 p.] Needs some revisions as indicated
- [3 p.] Acceptable
- [4 p.] Good grammar and vocabulary

3. Are the illustrations and tables clear, effective and understandable?

*Please select:*

- [0 p.] Unacceptable
- [1 p.] Major flaws, missing illustrations
- [2 p.] Partly inadequate
- [3 p.] Reasonable clear concept
- [4 p.] Complete, precise

**Your overall score of the formal qualities [min 0; max 1] is:  $(\Sigma II.) / 12 = 0.yy =$**

Instructions and advice regarding the formal qualities:

As a reviewer you should also advise the author(s) concerning the formal aspects of the intended paper. Please give your instructions and advice here.

### Review summary and recommendation

Based upon your scoring of the paper manuscript:

the content strength [min 0; max 1] is: **0,xx** = \_\_\_\_\_

the formal qualities [min 0; max 1] is: **0,yy** = \_\_\_\_\_

**i.e. overall score [min 0; max 1] is:  $(24 \times 0,xx + 12 \times 0,yy)/36 = 0,zz =$**

**From it follows, that your final evaluation of the intended paper is:**

0	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.5	0.6	0.7	0.8	0.9	1
not acceptable		acceptable with major revisions		acceptable with minor revisions		acceptable as it is				

**In case your overall score is over 0.85 it is a must to comment and reason so high rating (paper must be really exceptionally quality to be rated by so high rating). Please, write down a few 5 sentences explaining such a high evaluation into section Comments to the MM Science Journal redaction (next page).**

## Reflection

What is your competence as a referee in relation to the actual paper and topic?

*Please select:*

- I am an expert in the subject area of the paper
- I am knowledgeable in the area but not an expert
- I am not an expert; my evaluation is that of an informed outsider

Do you have comments to the MM Science Journal redaction (not to be forward to the author(s)) concerning your evaluation, the paper, your comments etc ?

Please check when ready:

- This is my final version of the review**

*Reference: McAloone T. and Andreasen M.M., DESIGN 2008 Conference Paper Review Form, Dubrovnik. Technical University of Denmark, Lyngby, Denmark, 2008*

*Your personal data are handled in accordance with the principles of new EU Regulations on the protection of personal data (GDPR).*

*In case of any questions regarding our principles connected with the protection of personal data or data contained in our filing system, please contact us: [dagmar.podolakova@mmscience.eu](mailto:dagmar.podolakova@mmscience.eu)*

November 15th, 2021  
Prague, Czech Republic

To whom it may concern,

We are pleased to inform you that the manuscript THE EFFECT OF DEEP CRYOGENIC ON TENSILE STRENGTH AND IMPACT TOUGHNESS IN QUENCH TEMPERED STEEL PLATE AS A CANDIDATE FOR BALLISTIC RESISTANCE MATERIAL (main author: Mr. Helmy Purwanto) has passed successfully the MM Science Journal review process and will be published in the December issue of the MM Science Journal which is planned for December 14th, 2021.

Kind regards



MM publishing, s.r.o.  
101 00 Praha 10, Přípotocní 1519/10A  
IČO: 27129721  
DIČ: CZ27129721  
e. 00100

Nikola Matolinova  
Editorial secretary of MM Science Journal

MM Science Journal, MM publishing, s.r.o.  
Přípotocní, 151910A, 101 00 Praha 10  
tel. +420 775 245 809, 222 365 170  
nikola.matolinova@mmscience.eu, <http://www.mmscience.eu/>