

## REVIEWER EVALUATION FORM (Please email to pdayal@euec.com)

Name of Reviewer: \_\_\_\_\_ E-Mail \_\_\_\_\_

Organization \_\_\_\_\_ Phone \_\_\_\_\_

Paper No.	Title	Date	
Authors(s)			
Originality of work <sup>1</sup>	Unacceptable	Acceptable with changes	Acceptable
Engineering and Scientific relevance <sup>2</sup>	Unacceptable	Acceptable with changes	Acceptable
Completeness of work <sup>3</sup>	Unacceptable	Acceptable with changes	Acceptable
References <sup>4</sup>	Unacceptable	Acceptable with changes	Acceptable
Clarity in writing tables, graphs and illustrations <sup>5</sup>	Unacceptable	Acceptable with changes	Acceptable
Formatting and Grammar per Style Guide <sup>6</sup>	Unacceptable	Acceptable with changes	Acceptable

**Summary Recommendation:**<sup>10</sup>

- ACCEPTED WITH NO REVISIONS REQUIRED**<sup>11</sup>
- REVISIONS ARE OPTIONAL.** Author may make the requested changes in the final text.
- REVISIONS REQUIRED.** Author is required to make mandatory revisions in the final text.
- DO NOT PUBLISH (Reject)**<sup>12</sup> Once this box is checked, an e-mail is generated to the Track Chairs.

**General Comments: (please use additional pages)**

1

Originality is a measure of the creativity or inventiveness of the author. However, in the review process, originality must be interpreted not only in the sense of a new physical creation, but must include such items as new concepts, techniques or methods. The measure of originality of the reported work will be determined by the reviewer and will be based on what is known of past and current developments in the specific field.

2

The reviewer is perceived to be an expert — it is the reviewer’s responsibility to make a subjective evaluation of the importance or worth of the reported work. The reviewer must judge the merit or value of another’s contribution.

3

The completeness of the reported work refers to the wholeness of the work. The reported work should be marked by a unity and continuity of parts and show interdependence between these parts. The reported work should exhibit a level of accomplishment by the author. Completeness is not a concern about the content of the text; it is a rating of the author’s ability to formulate and pursue a technical program at a professional level.

4

Acknowledgment of the work of others by references. The references should be both adequate and accurate in content.

5

Clarity in writing, tables, graphs and illustrations. The author must also show accuracy and skill in the use of formulas, graphs and diagrams.

6

Click on Style Guide link

7

The organization of the paper is extremely important if the reader is to understand the work of the author. Ideas are most effectively communicated when there is a carefully planned and logical structure in the manuscript.

8

Prior publication refers to the reproduction and distribution of a paper that can be obtained in the normal process of literature search.

9

Unacceptable technical papers are those having a sales approach (commercialism) to technical problems, those based upon fallacious or dubious engineering analysis and those whose approach is superficially descriptive of widely accepted engineering practice.

10

Papers recommended for publication should be of high quality and be of current technical interest and meet all EUEC criteria. Reviewing technical papers is an intellectual process that includes both subjective and objective elements. The reviewer must eliminate any personal bias toward the author or the subject matter. At the same time, the paper must be evaluated in terms of the reviewer’s own experience and knowledge in a specialized technical field.

11

**An acceptable technical paper** is one that is technically sound, free from personalities, bias and commercialism. A paper in which the author supplies information never before published in a form readily available to the public, or adds a new concept or development to existing technical knowledge. The definition should be construed to include comprehensive reviews to past and present engineering practice. Good indicates very acceptable levels of accomplishment and is approved for publication. Acceptable and Marginal quality will be considered from a subjective viewpoint. The concept of acceptability will vary with each reviewer. The basis of the evaluation is the reviewer’s own professional experience and knowledge of technical literature.

12

If rejection is recommended, state reasons in a professional and appropriate manner.