

ENSC 803 BLIND REVIEW FORM

NOTE: This page will not be given to the author.

Name of Reviewer: _____

E-mail Address: _____

Title of Paper: _____

Please complete this form and return 2 copies of it along with 2 copies of the marked-up manuscript.

I. REVIEW

A. *Suitability of topic*

1. Is the topic appropriate for publication in an IEEE (or equivalent) Journal?

_____ Yes _____ Perhaps _____ Unsure

2. Is the topic important to colleagues working in the field?

_____ Yes _____ Moderately So _____ No (explain) _____ Unsure

B. *Content*

1. Is the paper technically sound? If no, why not?

_____ Yes _____ No _____ Unsure

2. Is the coverage of the topic sufficiently comprehensive and balanced?

_____ Yes
_____ Important information is missing or superficially treated.
_____ Treatment somewhat unbalanced, but not seriously so.
_____ Certain parts are significantly overstressed.

3. How would you describe the technical depth of the paper?

- Superficial
- Suitable for the non-specialist
- Appropriate for the generally knowledgeable individual working in the field
- Suitable only for an expert

4. How would you rate the technical novelty of the paper?

- Novel
- Somewhat Novel
- Not Novel

C. Presentation

1. How would you rate the overall organization of the paper?

- Satisfactory
- Could be improved
- Poor

2. Are the title and abstract satisfactory?

- Yes
- No (explain)

3. Is the length of the paper appropriate? If not, recommend how the length of the paper should be amended, including a possible target length for the final manuscript.

- Yes
- No

4. Are symbols, terms, and concepts adequately defined?

_____ Yes _____ Not always _____ No

5. How do you rate the English usage?

_____ Satisfactory _____ Needs Improvement

6. How do you rate the list of references?

_____ Satisfactory _____ Unsatisfactory (explain)

D. Overall rating (circle appropriate rating)

1. How would you rate the technical contents of the paper?

1.....2.....3.....4
Excellent Good Fair Poor

2. How would you rate the novelty of the paper?

1.....2.....3.....4
Highly Novel Sufficiently Novel Slightly Novel Not Novel

3. How would you rate the appropriateness of this paper for an IEEE (or equivalent) Journal?

1.....2.....3.....4
Excellent Match Good Match Weak Match Poor Match

III. RECOMMENDATION

Code

- A Publish unaltered
- AQ Publish with minor changes (as noted in Section II)
- RQ Review again after major changes (as noted in Section II)
- R Reject (paper is of insufficient quality or novelty to be published)
- R Reject (a major rewrite is required, but author should be encouraged to resubmit rewritten paper at some later time.)
- R Reject (paper is seriously flawed; do not encourage resubmission.)