Review Form

The International Conference on Intelligent Systems Iasi 2004

Paper #: (filled in by the Editorial Staff)
Reviewer name:
Review sent on:....(filled in by the Editorial Staff)
Reviewer #: (filled in by the Editorial Staff)
Review received on: ....

Referee's Evaluation

To be sent before:
Title of the paper:
Author(s):

Scientific novelty:
❑ excellent ❑ very high ❑ high ❑ good ❑ modest ❑ no novelty

Applicative novelty:
❑ excellent ❑ very high ❑ high ❑ good ❑ modest ❑ no novelty

Correctness:
❑ no error ❑ a few minor errors ❑ some errors ❑ essentially erroneous
   (please comment)

Scientific overall quality:
❑ excellent ❑ very high ❑ high ❑ fair ❑ modest ❑ no scientific content

Language:
   ❑ correct ❑ a few corrections ❑ poor ❑ incomprehensible
Clarity:
   ❑ excellent ❑ good ❑ fair ❑ poor ❑ unreadable
Organization:
   ❑ excellent ❑ good ❑ fair ❑ poor ❑ chaotic
Style:
   ❑ concise ❑ a little verbose ❑ too verbose

The topic of this paper fits this Conference:
      ❑ perfectly   ❑ well   ❑ fairly   ❑ poorly   ❑ does not fit

Audience of the paper:

❑ most specialists in the field
❑ most engineers applying intelligent systems
❑ only a few specialists of high level
❑ a reasonable proportion of the audience of this conference
❑ a reasonable proportion of engineers applying intelligent systems
❑ possibly some scientists in the field
❑ maybe some doctoral students
❑ I wonder if someone will be interested by the content of this paper

References:
[*] essential references: ❑ OK   ❑ some are missing   ❑ completely missing
                ❑ not the case[*] ([*] this paper opens a new field; nothing similar exists in the literature)
[*] recent similar works: ❑ OK   ❑ missing   ❑ not the case (no similar research exists)
[*] are appropriate: ❑ OK   ❑(some) references are not useful   ❑ not the case
[*] are cited according to the recommendations in the Instructions for Authors? ❑ yes ❑ no

Manuscript typing:
[*] is it according to the Instructions for Authors? ❑ yes   ❑ no
[*] formulas are readable: ❑ yes   ❑ no
[*] formulas are numbered: ❑ yes   ❑ no

Figures and tables:
[*] are correctly and clearly drawn?   ❑ yes   ❑ no
[*] are relevant?   ❑ yes   ❑ no

Keywords:
[*] are given?   ❑ yes   ❑ no
[*] are they relevant?   ❑ yes   ❑ only partly   ❑ rather irrelevant

Title:
❑ OK   ❑ not enough informative   ❑ not reflecting the content   ❑ too long

Final opinion:
❑ publish, an excellent paper;
❑ publish, a good paper;
❑ publish as such, if space is available, or send for improvements and revision (comments included);

❑ publish after minor revision and improvements (comments included);

❑ can be published only if major revisions and improvements (comments included) are made; send the paper to the authors, with comments;

❑ ask to the author(s) to reduce the paper to a short communication or a technical note;

❑ modest paper: recommend for possible publication in another conference Proceedings;

❑ magazine-type paper: recommend for publication in another conference

❑ poor paper, reject

Essential Suggestions

✎ Suggested Title:

✎ Suggested keywords:

✎ Suggested references:

Review Summary (referee's comments) ✎

To be sent back to: Prof. Horia-Nicolai Teodorescu

Technical University of Iasi, Copou 11, Iasi 700506, Romania

e-mail: hteodor@etc.tuiasi.ro , isidor@etc.tuiasi.ro

We will be grateful to all those who will send us their comments and suggestions in order to improve our publication policy, and the refereeing procedure.