

NOTES TO REVIEWS (EPE 2016)

In order to clarify scoring of the papers, here you can find notes to reviews.

Review form and papers evaluation

Papers are reviewed in terms of set of questions, which should all be answered by choosing the options that fit best in the reviewer's opinion. Moreover there is space for reviewers to add comments to each paper.

Notes to options

1. Topicality of the theme:

Reviewers are asked to compare paper intent with following conference topics together with topicality of the paper choosing one of the options which fits best.

The conference topics: Power Systems Planning and Development - Power Systems Reliability and Maintenance, Asset Management - New Trends in Electrical Power Transmission, HVDC, WAMPaC - Advanced Distribution Systems, Smart Grids, Micro Grids - Renewable Energy Sources and Storage Devices - EMC, Power Quality Measurement and Improvement - FACTS Controllers in Transmission and Distribution Systems - High Voltage Technology, Measurements and Diagnostics - Transient Voltages, Insulation Coordination, Overvoltage Protection - Electrical Machines, Drives and Power Electronics - Smart Artificial Outdoor and Indoor Lighting Systems - Electrical Heat in Industrial Technologies and Intelligent Buildings - Nuclear Energy Research, Utilization and Safety.

Options: highly topical; topical; less topical; not topical.

Notes: "Not topical" is chosen if the paper does not fit into the conference topics mentioned above or into closely related topics. If it does, one of the options according to the paper topicality is selected.

2. The paper's contribution:

Reviewers are asked to recognize and evaluate paper contribution and then to choose one of the options which fits best.

Options: new methods and techniques; demonstration or application to a challenge; a useful review; unvalued.

Notes: Each of the papers accepted for publication is expected to have a contribution at least in one aspect expressed by first three options. The paper is supposed 1) to describe new methods or techniques with or without a numerical and/or physical/practical demonstration of them; 2) to describe a demonstration or application of some established methods or techniques to a new or well-established challenge; 3) to present a useful review. In case the paper does not fit in above options then its contribution is probably pointless and reviewers are asked to choose fourth option having such meaning.

3. The paper is original:

Reviewers are asked to review the paper originality and to choose adequate option.

Options: yes; only partially; no.

Notes: Decision is made according to the reviewer's best knowledge in. The first option ("Yes") is selected if reviewer can consider the paper content to be significantly extended or developed over the authors' previous work/papers or other papers respectively. And "No" is chosen in case reviewers are sure the paper of more or less the same content has been already published somewhere else. If so, reviewers are asked to insert a comment including link to the source.

4. The references are adequate:

Reviewers are asked to choose one of the following options, whichever describes adequacy of references to existing literature best.

Options: yes; only partially; no.

Notes: The paper should refer to related literature giving notice that current state of art has been taken into account. Moreover unrelated references are forbidden. If reviewer considers even one reference to be improper, then option "No" is selected and specification should be inserted to comments.

5. Quality of presentation:

Reviewers are asked to choose which one of the following best describes the form/way of presentation.

Options: high quality; sufficient; insufficient.

Notes: The chosen option should, among others, result from following questions. Is the paper well organized and structured? Is the paper content well developed? Are the equations, figures, tables, results, etc. well described? Are the figures and tables easy to read? Reviewers are asked to give proper comments to the authors in order to help them to improve the quality of presentation.

6. Overall comprehensibility:

Reviewers are asked to choose one of the following options evaluating language level of the paper. There is essential if the paper message is conveyed in a clear way and the English level.

Options: comprehensible; less comprehensible; incomprehensible.

Notes: Reason for decreased rating should be indicated in the comments.

7. Final recommendation for the publication of the paper in the conference proceedings:

Reviewers are asked to make a final recommendation according to their own judgement and with respect to the notes below.

Options: accept in its current form; accept after revision; unsure; reject.

Notes: Reviewers are asked to choose to reject the paper if its intent is out of the conference scope and/or if the paper contribution is unvalued and/or if they are sure that the paper of more or less the same content has been already published somewhere else. If there are other reasons leading to last two options, it would be explained in comments.

8. Comments to the authors:

The box is used to insert the comments to the questions 1 to 7 and any other comments reviewers consider to be required/useful.

Yours sincerely,

Jan Svec

On behalf of the EPE 2016 Conference Technical Program, Reviewing and Organizing Committees