

Reviewing scheme

Category	Rating	Evaluation	Criteria
Technical Quality	6	Outstanding	Outstanding paper presenting innovative concepts, applications or methodology, or fresh insights from a case study. Exemplary account of a complete piece of work with definitive conclusions, fully supported by theory, data or results, as appropriate. First public exposure.
	5	Strong	High quality paper presenting largely new ideas, techniques, results or interpretations. Well founded argument leading to crisp conclusions, with assumptions clearly stated and discussed. Worthy of journal publication.
	4	Good	Good quality paper that describes some new ideas, techniques, results or interpretations. Clear conclusions, although some aspects of the work possibly still in progress. <i>Alternatively</i> , a high quality paper that describes existing ideas, techniques, results or interpretations with fresh insight as a review or informative tutorial. Worthy of consideration for journal publication.
	3	Satisfactory	Many papers fall into this category, presenting, for example, an incremental development in an existing technique. <i>Alternatively</i> , a more significant development with the work still in progress; or a useful review or tutorial.
	2	Adequate	Paper containing some new content or information, or a fair review, sufficient to justify its selection for presentation at the conference.
	1	Weak	Paper that contains negligible new content, is uninformative, or incoherent.
	0	Flawed	Paper containing one or more serious technical flaws such that the results are incorrect or the conclusions are not justified.
Impact/Relevance	4	Important	A development that will have a major impact on our knowledge, understanding or methodology, or will be of great economic value.
	3	Significant	Has the potential to make a significant impact on our knowledge, understanding or methodology, or to be of economic value.
	2	Limited	Has the potential to make a limited impact on our knowledge, understanding or methodology, or to be of some limited economic value.
	1	None	Negligible potential to make an impact or not relevant for our members.
Presentation	4	Excellent	Text easy to understand in articulate, accurate English with minimal jargon; figures uncluttered, well-constructed and with clearly labeled scales.
	3	Good	Clear, readable English, possibly with some repetition or use of jargon. Good figures but possibly too cramped, or scales hard to read, or captions repeated in the text.
	2	Adequate	Understandable but with some confusion due to poor English constructions, heavy use of jargon, or figures with missing scales/labels or minimal captions.
	1	Poor	Difficult to understand through obscure language or poor figures.
Commercialism	no	This is not a commercial paper	No overt or excessive commercialism. Where trademarks are included, their use has been kept to an acceptable minimum.
	yes	This is a commercial paper	Clearly intended for marketing purposes rather than technical enlightenment. NB This rating gives an overall score of zero.

Score = (Technical quality + Impact/Relevance + Presentation)