

Dear

.....

Editorial board of the Journal Informacije MIDEM chose you to act as a reviewer of the sent article. Based on your judgement the board will decide whether to publish or refuse the contribution. Please, return the form giving also written opinion about the contribution.

We are expecting your answer within 14 days.

*Uredništvo revije " Informacije MIDEM " Vas je izbralo za recenzenta priloženega prispevka. Na osnovi Vašega mnenja se bo uredništvo odločilo za objavo ali zavrnitev prispevka. Prosim, poleg obrazca podajte tudi pismeno mnenje o prispevku.
 PROSIM ZA STROKOVNO RECENZIJO ČLANKA V ROKU 14 DNI PO PREJETJU.*

Author :	Title :
<p>Md. Zulfiker. Mahmud, Mohammad. Tariqul. Islam</p>	<p>An Irregular-ground Orientated Miniaturized Patch Antenna for UWB Industrial Applications</p>

Ljubljana :

Editor-in-chief
 Marko Topič:

REVIEW POINTS
(MERILA ZA RECENZIJO)

	YES	NO	Partially
Is the contribution content appropriate for publishing? <i>Ali je prispevek dovolj tehten in vsebinsko primeren za objavo ?</i>		X	
Is the content on the appropriate scientific level? <i>Ali je vsebina na ustrezni znanstveno strokovni ravni ?</i>		X	
Has the contribution been published in the same or similar form before ? where? <i>Ali je bil material že objavljen v takšni ali podobni obliki ? Kje ?</i>			X
Is the contribution prepared according to instructions for authors? <i>Ali je prispevek napisan in opremljen v skladu z navodili za avtorje ?</i>			X
Is data reliable and documents the findings appropriately ? <i>Ali so podatki zanesljivi in zadostno dokumentirajo ugotovitve ?</i>		X	

REVIEWER'S EXPLANATION :

OBRAZLOŽITEV RECENZENTA :

[See attached page with comments!](#)

SUGGESTIONS TO THE EDITORIAL BOARD:

PREDLOGI UREDNIŠTVU :

- ◇ The contribution can be accepted as original scientific work (prispevek lahko sprejmete kot izvirno znanstveno delo)
- ◇ The contribution can be accepted as professional work (prispevek lahko sprejmete kot strokovno delo)
- ◇ The contribution can be accepted as an overview work (prispevek lahko sprejmete kot pregledno delo)
- ◇ The contribution can be accepted after corrections (prispevek lahko sprejmete po popravkih)
- ◇ **the contribution is to be rejected** (prispevek zavrnite)

Reviewer (Recenzijo opravil)	Date (datum) :
Matjaz Vidmar	28.06.2016

- (1) The loss tangent of the FR4 laminate is stated as 0.0025 on page 2 and as 0.025 on page 5 of the same article.
- (2) The sawtooth in the defected ground-plane is much smaller than the wavelength. A current-distribution computation is required as a proof that it has any effect on the performance of the antenna.
- (3) Figure 3 is unreadable and can not be reproduced in a black-and-white magazine.
- (4) The antenna does not have a balun or other structures to stop currents on the outside surface of the coaxial feedline. Therefore the latter acts as part of the antenna.
- (5) Although the antenna is well matched at low frequencies, its radiation efficiency is declared low. Neither dielectric losses nor copper losses of the proposed structure can explain this drop of efficiency at low frequencies.
- (6) Co-polarization and cross-polarization are not defined, since the desired polarization of the antenna is not defined either.