

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 : |
|---|--|
| Hua Zhao, Hongfei Yao, Yongbo Su, Xinyu Liu and Zhi Jin | A Broadband Waveguide-to-Microstrip Transition for Millimeter-Wave applications |

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) : |
| Matjaž Vidmar | 09.08.2016 |

- (1) The following sentence in the abstract: "The measured results indicate that the insertion loss of the single transition is smaller than 11dB, and the return loss is better than 11dB over the frequency from 75GHz to 105GHz." does not make sense, probably it contains typing errors? Further this does not correspond to what you say at the end of the article.
- (2) Please explain the following sentence: "However, some passive elements using waveguide technology with low-loss, high-Q still are required to obtain satisfied performances." In a broadband waveguide-to-microstrip transition we usually do not want high-Q by definition?
- (3) Color drawings like Figure 1, Figure 3 can not be reproduced in a black-and-white magazine.
- (4) Equations (1) and (2) are corrupted in the source file.
- (5) What is " $Z_0=50\ \Omega$ "?
- (6) The dimension $w_3=0.39\text{mm}$ corresponds to about $0.2\ \lambda$ in the given substrate. This is not small compared to the wavelength, therefore a TEM approximation does not make sense.
- (7) On Figure 6, the scale for S_{21} goes from -40dB to -200dB. This does not make sense.
- (8) On Figure 6, the scale for S_{11} goes from -20dB to -60dB. This does not make sense.
- (9) Please explain the radiation loss you mention in your closed cavity structure.
- (10) overall the text contains many typing mistakes, inappropriate expressions and grammar errors. These MUST be corrected for publication.