REVIEW FORM for OVERVIEW PAPERS

Date of sending this form:

Date for returning this form:

Paper Author:

Paper Title:

General comments. In the highly fragmented world of computer science it is very often the case that professionals lose track of what is currently going on in other areas. Overview papers covering subareas of computer science are intended to remedy this situation.

Each paper should contain a historical perspective on the developments up to date (supported by an extensive bibliography) as well as information about the state of the art in the subdiscipline. It should describe the research that is currently considered the most important and which roads are considered to be the most promising. The paper must also be accessible to computer professionals who do not have detailed knowledge of the subject.

We consider the role of the referees to be crucial to the quality of the papers that will be published as overview papers. To help us with publishing the best possible papers that can be of real help to the computer professionals, please provide as detailed comments to the following questions as possible. All of your comments will be returned to the author while you remain anonymous.

Detailed Review - please evaluate each category.

1. Is the subarea selected for the overview appropriate (coherent, unified, not too broad, not too narrow)?

2. What is your assessment of the need for an overview paper in this subarea of CS?

3. Have you seen any other overview paper covering this subarea of CS? If yes, please provide the reference(s).

4. Is the paper understandable to a broader scientific audience, not only to specialists? If not, what needs to be rewritten?

5. Is the paper technically sound (free of technical, mathematical, logical or other faults or inconsistencies)? Please mark the necessary corrections in the text or make suggestions on separate pages.

6. Does the discussion of the historical background contain all the important facts and developments? If not, what is missing?

7. Is the description of the "state of the art" complete? If not, what is missing?

8. Is the discussion of current research directions complete? If not, what is missing?

9. Is the bibliography complete? If not, what is missing?

10. Is the writing clear? Is the English correct? Please make suggestions in the text or make them on separate pages.

11. Are all the referenced figures, tables and references contained in the text?

II. General evaluation of the paper (please use additional pages if necessary).

III. Recommendation. Please check the appropriate answer.

❑ Publish as is

❑ Publish with minor corrections or additions as noted

❑ Major changes and a second review are required

❑ Reject

How confident are you of your evaluation? Please circle your answer.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7

somewhat confident   confident   very confident

Do you consider yourself (please check the appropriate answer):

❑ a specialist in the area
❑ a competent professional in this area
❑ a professional with some knowledge of the area
❑ a non-specialist

_____   _____

Reviewer's name   Reviewer's signature and date

Do you have any additional comments for the journal editors?

The author's right to unpublished manuscripts: The manuscript is a privileged document; the author retains the right to the unpublished work. A referee should not use the results or ideas obtained exclusively through the refereeing process in his/her research.

Please send this form (and possibly a copy of the manuscript) to the appropriate editor.