

# 22nd International Meshing Roundtable Reviewer Guidelines

The International Meshing Roundtable (IMR) conference supports the process of peer review. This means that the conference relies on reviewers to determine the suitability of manuscripts for publication. Two or Three referees are asked to comment on each submitted article and, if it is thought necessary, other referees may be asked their opinion. Under no circumstance should a reviewer make direct contact with the author (any concerns must be directed to the IMR committee). The IMR committee greatly appreciates the significant time commitment that it takes to review a manuscript. Reviewers are listed and publicly thanked in the conference proceedings.

Reviewers are responsible for maintaining the integrity and confidentiality of the authors' work while it is being evaluated for publication. Manuscripts sent for review are privileged communications and are the private property of the authors. Reviewers must destroy copies of the manuscripts, both paper and digital, after completing their review. Also, information gained through working with manuscripts must not be used for private gain in any way. Reviewers must disclose all relationships that could be viewed as presenting a potential conflict of interest. Conflicts of interest can occur because of financial relationships, personal relationships, academic competition, and intellectual passion.

It is the responsibility of reviewers to critically evaluate manuscripts. Nevertheless, it is important that reviewers adopt a positive and impartial attitude toward the manuscript under review, with the aim of enhancing the quality of the manuscript. Reviewers are in a privileged position and must avoid using language that is either emotive or derogatory.

## To volunteer as a Reviewer

Sign up on the "Review Committee" at <http://www.openconf.org/IMR22>. You will need to enter the Keycode "IMR22revkey".

After register and logging in, you will find a list of the submissions that you have been assigned to review, along with links to download and submit an evaluation. If you have any trouble downloading the file please contact us immediately. If you feel very strongly that you cannot review any of the papers assigned to you, please contact us and we will try our best to accommodate your request.

## Guidelines for Paper Review

The review form includes the fields:

- I. **Recommendation**. Considering everything as a whole do you recommend that this paper be accepted or rejected?
- II. **Overall Value Added to the Field**. What new material is being proposed by the paper? Is it new information, or simply a new perspective on an existing method?

- III. **Reviewer Familiarity with Subject Matter.** How familiar are you with the conference sub-topics covered in this paper.
- IV. **Is this submission a candidate for the best submission award?** Each year a “Best Technical Paper Award” is presented at the conference. Should the committee consider this paper for this award?
- V. **If from reading the submission you know who the author is, how different is this from earlier submissions on the same topic by the same author? That is, is it the same as or a slight modification of other submissions, with little or no new information?** Compare this submission to other papers by the same author. Is this a repeat of same material, or is there new material presented?
- VI. **Which of the following session(s) would be the most appropriate for this submission?** What conference sub-topic does this paper best align with? The committee will consider this when scheduling papers for presentation at the conference.
- Comments for the Authors.** Give the author rational for your accept/reject recommendation above. Keep your comments constructive, clear and positive. Consider the following:
- a. What is your reason for your recommendation above?
  - b. Technical comments for authors:
    - i. What were the main contributions?
    - ii. What did you learn reading the paper?
    - iii. Suggest related work/papers that the submission fails to reference.
    - iv. Describe any serious technical mistakes.
    - v. Describe what would make the paper stronger and/or change your recommendation.
    - vi. Describe any unreasonable assumptions made in the paper
  - c. Presentation style:
    - i. Does the paper describe clearly its goals?
    - ii. Did the paper deliver what originally promised?
    - iii. Is the bibliography format/list of keywords complete?
    - iv. Are the figures readable? Can you see the trend? Do they explain the trend or "strange behavior"? Do the results in the figures make sense? If not, mention it in the review. Raise questions...
    - v. List any writing style remarks/corrections (English grammar/syntax, spelling) ...
- VII. **Comments for the Program Committee (authors will not see these comments).** Provide any comments that you wish to kept confidential from the author.
- VIII. **Email me a copy of this review.** If you would like a copy of the review will be emailed to you for your records.
- IX. **I have completed the review.** Check this box when you are finished with the review. If you are not finished, leave this unchecked, and you will be able to return and finish your review at a later time. Be sure to return before the July 12<sup>th</sup>, 2013 deadline.

## **Submit your report**

Reviews are to be entered on the same webpage that you used for downloading the paper (<http://www.openconf.org/IMR22>). Timeliness is important. Reviews should be completed online by July 12, 2013. If this is not possible, or the paper is not in your area of expertise, alternative arrangements will be made if you notify the IMR committee (it would help us if you provided the contact details of an alternative reviewer).

Thank you again for the important contribution you are about to make to the 22nd IMR conference. For assistance please contact:

Matt Staten  
Papers Committee Chair, 22nd IMR conference  
Sandia National Laboratories  
[mstate@sandia.gov](mailto:mstate@sandia.gov)