**IAJC/ISAM Conference Paper Rating Form**

Please review this paper critically; your professional judgment will help maintain the quality and credibility of our conferences. This review will also be used after the conference for decisions on publishing associated papers in our journals. If you have serious questions or concerns about this paper, it is preferable to reject it at this stage of the review process. Keep in mind that a copy of your review will be sent to the author(s), so please be specific in your comments and mark-ups as an aid to the author(s) for possible revisions.

**ALL CORRESPONDENCE WILL BE VIA EMAIL.**

**NOTE: Please do NOT use snail mail or fax to return any files to me. A version of both this form and your electronically “marked-up” version of the paper will be sent to the author(s).**

1. Complete this electronic form and send it via email to me. Please be careful to respond to each question or statement on this form, even if you feel the options do not allow for a perfect response.
2. This step is not required, but both I and the authors of the paper you are reviewing find it extremely helpful to get your written comments right on the actual paper itself. To do this, once you have downloaded the paper you plan to review, save it temporarily on your computer, turn on the “track changes” feature in *Word* (under the Review tab), then add any revisions or make any comments you wish right on the document itself. When finished, send a copy of the “marked-up” paper to me via email.

**Philip D. Weinsier**

**2016 IAJC/ISAM Conference General Chair**

**Email:** **philipw@bgsu.edu**

**The number of the paper I am reviewing is:**

**The title of the paper I am reviewing is:**

Please consider and evaluate the following points in your review:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Is the subject of the paper of interest for our conferences and journals?
 | [ ] YES | [ ] NO |
| 1. Is the treatment of the subject appropriate for fields related to engineering or engineering technology?
 | [ ] YES | [ ] NO |
| 1. Does the paper present new or innovative ideas or material?
 | [ ] YES | [ ] NO |
| 1. If the subject of the paper is technical, does the subject represent current technology?
 | [ ] YES | [ ] NO |
| 5. Is the information in the paper sound, factual and accurate? If you answered NO, please explain. | [ ] YES | [ ] NO |

6. Rate the paper on its contribution to the body of knowledge for fields

 associated with or related to engineering or engineering technology.

[ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No Contribution**  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | **Critically Important Contribution** |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 7. Does the paper cite and use appropriate references? | [ ] YES | [ ] NO |
| 8. Is the paper written in a scholarly tone? | [ ] YES | [ ] NO |

9. Rate how well the author presents his or her ideas.

[ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Very Difficult to Understand**  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | **Very Easy to Understand** |

10. Rate the overall quality of the writing.

[ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Very Poor**  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | **Excellent** |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 11. Should anything be deleted from or condensed in the paper? If YES, please explain.       | [ ] YES | [ ] NO |
| 12. Is the treatment of the subject complete (no important ideas, analyses or information omitted)? | [ ] YES | [ ] NO |

Please select ONLY ONE of these four options as your final recommendation.

**[ ]  ACCEPT AS IS**

**[ ]  ACCEPT WITH MINOR REVISIONS**

Please provide feedback within the manuscript and/or in the COMMENTS section.

**[ ]  RETURN TO THE AUTHOR(S) FOR SUBSTANTIAL REVISION**

Please provide feedback within the manuscript and/or in the COMMENTS section.

**[ ]  REJECT – DO NOT PUBLISH**

Please give a detailed summary of your reasons for rejection in the COMMENTS section.

**COMMENTS**: