**Reviewer Decision Form**

Paper Title:

Date Reviewed:

**Due Date for Review: (generally within 6 weeks after receipt of the manuscript)**

Thank you for your willingness to serve as a reviewer. Peer review is one of the most important activities of our Society, and your help is appreciated. Written comments are usually the most helpful part of a review. Please provide comments on the second page or on separate sheets. The grading section below is intended to help identify key points for written comments, and also to allow comparisons among different reviewers. A good paper should have a high overall score but does not have to score well in all aspects to be acceptable. For example, a concise, critical review paper is a valuable publication, although it might have little intrinsic originality. A paper introducing important new concepts might be valuable even with limited experimental work.

***Note*** that the Journal just accepts two kinds of papers, an article with a new contribution or a review paper that has a comparison between some related methods supported with experiments. ***Please*** if the paper does not have a contribution to the field, just reject it and explain the reasons for rejection.

**Paper Grading (please underline the most appropriate number):**

1. Original, elegant 5 4 3 2 1 0 Restatement of existing knowledge

**if review paper:** new results 5 4 3 2 1 0 results have been previously published

1. Valuable for practicing engineers 5 4 3 2 1 0 Impractical or excessively commercial
2. Technically and mathematically accurate 5 4 3 2 1 0 Unsound; contains significant errors.

**if review paper:** review most of the recent methods 5 4 3 2 1 0 just comparing very old methods

1. Well supported with analysis and experimental evidence 5 4 3 2 1 0 Unproven, unsupported.
2. Rich in engineering judgment and insight 5 4 3 2 1 0 Uninformed, amateurish.
3. Clear, concise, effective presentation 5 4 3 2 1 0 Obscure, disorganized, verbose
4. Interesting to readers, stimulate new ideas 5 4 3 2 1 0 Uninteresting; the topic is nearly cliche
5. Effective illustrations and tables 5 4 3 2 1 0 Poor figures or figures without discussion
6. Correct language usage 5 4 3 2 1 0 Weak grammar; difficult to follow
7. Useful references to past work 5 4 3 2 1 0 No context is provided beyond the

 authors' work

**Recommendation (check just one of them):**

1. Accept without change – The paper can be published in its current form.
2. Accept with suggested but not mandatory changes – The paper can be published in its current form but could be made stronger by incorporating changes suggested by reviewers found on the following page.
3. Accept with mandatory changes – The paper cannot be published in its current form but is provisionally accepted if the authors incorporate mandatory changes suggested by the reviewers. It is the opinion of this reviewer that the changes are relatively minor and can be incorporated in ten weeks or less. (Reviewer, please provide comments on the following page.)
4. Do not accept – The paper cannot be accepted in its current form. (Reviewer, please provide comments on the following page.)

**Comments and Suggestions for Revisions:**

Use additional page(s) if necessary:

Use Arabic or English language to write your comments:

Basic Qualification Questions:

1. Based on your assessment rather than author statements, what is the new contribution of this paper?

1. Does the contribution have good archival value, or is it only incremental to existing knowledge?

1. Comments to the author(s) to improve the paper/explain required mandatory changes/ justify rejection:

 **. Clarity of Research Objectives:**

 **. Literature Review**

 **. Methodology Description:**

 **. Results and Discussion:**

 **. Conclusion:**

 **. Language and Writing Style:**

1. Comments to the editor

**.**
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Reviewer’s E-mail Address: