



Manuscript: **“Information on the Space. Systems Transdisciplinary Aspect”**

Submitted: 04 September 2020

Accepted: 19 October 2020

Published: 31 October 2020

Corresponding Author: V. S. Mokiy

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n29p26

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Blinded

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Date Manuscript Received: 15/09/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 15/10/2020
Manuscript Title: INFORMATION ON THE SPACE. SYSTEMS TRANSDISCIPLINARY ASPECT	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0982/20	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: No	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	
<i>The title is clear</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	
<i>I would suggest to report in the abstract the different examples described in the body of the paper.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling	

mistakes in this article.	
<i>The article is well written.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	
<i>The author clearly explains the methods.</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	
<i>What does the author mean with Frequency in Table 1? And what is the unit of such frequency (Hz?)?</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	
<i>The conclusions are properly written.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	
<i>Yes, references are comprehensive and appropriate.</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	X
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: