

Review Form

The following pages contain a review form and information intended to aid reviewers in the process of reviewing papers submitted to the Transactions for possible publication. Should you have any questions or concerns about the paper you are asked to review or the review process please contact the Associate Editor who asked you to review this paper.

Review Process and Procedures

1. The Transactions on Power Electronics at present conducts the entire paper submission and review process electronically as follows:
 - a. A paper is submitted to the Editor in Chief at peleditor@ieee.org.
 - b. The Paper is acknowledged and assigned a paper number.
 - c. The EIC assigns the paper to an Associate Editor, who will oversee the review process.
 - d. AE's solicits two or more reviews for the paper. (The IEEE requires a minimum of two reviews.)
 - e. After the reviewer completes the review, he or she then submits the completed review form to the AE electronically.
 - f. Once the AE has all of the reviews he or she makes a recommendation based on those reviews.
 - g. The AE then electronically submits the completed review forms to the EIC with the recommendation.
 - h. The EIC confirms the AE's recommendations or discusses the recommendation.
 - i. Once confirmed, the EIC informs the corresponding author of the recommendation and provides the review comments.
 - j. The EIC provides a copy of the recommendation and review comments to the AE and all the reviewers.
2. When reviewers submit their reviews to the AE it is perfectly in order to submit this by e-mail without a signature.
3. Reviews for the Transactions are done anonymously. *Only page 3 of this form and any additional pages with comments will be provided to the author(s).*
4. If a reviewer rejects a paper, it is essential to give proper feedback to the authors by completing the comments page of the review form to the best of your abilities.
5. Author(s) are given only one opportunity to improve upon a paper by making the necessary revisions and corrections. As such, it is important that the author(s) receive clear, concise, and thorough comments for improvements. Also keep in mind that there is a page limit for papers published in the Transactions; so usually, authors cannot comply with requests that will make the paper too long.

Due Date for Review: _____ **Reference Number:** _____
 (normally within 6 weeks after receipt of manuscript)

Paper Title: _____

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 that introduces important new concepts might be valuable even with limited experimental work.

Please note that prior publication in another archival journal, prior review for another IEEE Transactions, or overt commercialism will preclude acceptance of a paper. Please cite the source of such occurrences if possible.

Basic Qualification Questions:

1. What is the new contribution of this paper? (Based on your assessment rather than on author statements.)

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

Paper Grading (please circle the most appropriate number):

Original, elegant	5 4 3 2 1 0	Restatement of existing knowledge
Valuable for practicing engineers	5 4 3 2 1 0	Impractical or excessively commercial
Technically and mathematically accurate	5 4 3 2 1 0	Unsound; contains significant errors
Well supported with analysis and experimental evidence	5 4 3 2 1 0	Unproven, unsupported
Rich in engineering judgement and insight	5 4 3 2 1 0	Uninformed, amateurish
Clear, concise, effective presentation	5 4 3 2 1 0	Obscure, disorganized, verbose
Interesting to readers, stimulates new ideas	5 4 3 2 1 0	Uninteresting; topic is nearly cliché
Effective illustrations and tables	5 4 3 2 1 0	Poor figures or figures without discussion
Correct English usage	5 4 3 2 1 0	Weak grammar; difficult to follow
Useful references to past work	5 4 3 2 1 0	No context is provided beyond the authors' work

Total score _____

Recommendation (check one):

- Accept without change** – The paper can be published in its current form.
- 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 following page.
- 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.)

- Do not accept** – The paper cannot be accepted in its current form. (Reviewer, please provide comments on the following page.)

(Please Print Clearly)

Reviewer's Name: _____

Voice Telephone: _____ Fax Telephone: _____

Reviewer's Organization: _____

Reviewer's Postal Address: _____

Reviewer's E-mail Address: _____

Reviewer's Signature: _____ Date: _____



TRANSACTIONS ON POWER ELECTRONICS

Comments and Suggestions for Revisions
Use additional page(s) if necessary

Paper Title: _____

Paper Number: _____ **Date Reviewed:** _____

Basic Qualification Questions: (Please use additional pages if necessary.)

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

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

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