



Peer Review Policies and Criteria

Review Policies

- The **SDIMI2017 Technical Committee** does not reveal the identity of reviewers to author(s). It is suggested that reviewers remove their identities from the manuscript if marks are made directly on it.
- The unpublished manuscript is a privileged document and all intellectual properties belong to the authors. We ask reviewers to protect it from any form of exploitation, to refrain from using the information contained in the manuscript for the advancement of their own research and not to cite a manuscript before it has been published.
- If you are not in a position to evaluate a given article impartially, please advise the editor in charge with that explanation.
- Please give detailed comments that will help the editors to make a decision. Even if the manuscript cannot be accepted, we still would like to pass on constructive comments to help the author(s) improve.
- Reviewers are not required to make changes or to correct mistakes, but any help in spelling and grammar will be appreciated.
- When you write comments to the author's, please present criticism dispassionately and avoid use of abrasive remarks.
- The editors gratefully receive recommendations from reviewers. However, the editors may not be able to honour every recommendation a reviewer made since the editorial decisions are based on evaluations from several sources.

Evaluation Criteria

In evaluating the overall quality of a manuscript, please keep the following in mind:

- **Originality:** Does the paper present new, innovative or insightful information? Does it reflect up-to-date knowledge on the subject?
- **Importance:** Is the content important to the relevant field and of interest to the readers?
- **Methodology:** Are the approach, design or methods appropriate? Are the analytic or experimental techniques adequate? Are they described clearly?
- **Clarity:** Is the purpose of the paper clear? Does the paper stay focused? Are any areas vague or difficult to understand? Are there any inconsistencies in the paper?
- **Materials Organization:** Are ideas developed and related in a logic sequence? Are transitions between discussions smooth and easy to follow? Is the content consistent with the purpose of the paper?
- **Accuracy of Statements:** Is any information in the paper inaccurate? Are there any errors or contradictions?
- **Data Analysis and Interpretation:** Are the presented data credible? Are the figures and tables relevant? Are the legends and titles properly clarified? Is interpretation accurate?

- **Results and Conclusions:** Are the results relevant to the posed problem? Are conclusions sound and warranted by the data?
- **Figures, Tables and Referencing:** Are figures and tables good quality? Does the referencing format meet the requirements? Are the references up to date on the topic?
- **Technical English Writing:** Is the manuscript well written in English? readable?

Manuscript Evaluation Outcomes

All papers however have to go through a peer review process and meet the requirements. The outcome of manuscripts review will fall into one of the following categories:

1. **Accepted as is:** meeting the standards of the conference and no change required.
2. **Accepted subject to minor revisions:** high quality technical content and well written but requiring minor revisions (e.g., a few spelling or grammar errors, referencing, captioning and formatting issues, quality or presentation format of figures or tables, etc.). Revision is to be completed within (2) weeks and will be checked by an editor to ensure its completion.
3. **Accepted with condition on improved writing:** with valuable technical content and acceptable material organization, but not written to meet the English standard. The authors are strongly advised to seek assistance in technical English writing to raise its quality to the standard. The resubmitted manuscript will be reviewed by the editor in charge to ensure the revision is satisfactory.
4. **Acceptable but needs major revisions:** with good technical data but lack of detail, missing information, or in need of clarification and explanation, major changes in material organization and data presentation, additional illustrations, etc. Revisions would be able to complete within (4) weeks. The revised manuscript may be sent back to the original reviewer(s) or may require re-review.
5. **Rejected:** a) failing to meet the standard of the journal and revision may take more than (4) weeks, or b) the content is not suitable to the conference.

Reviewer's Report

The report from a reviewer contains the information required for the editors to evaluate the manuscript. Please complete the report and send it to the contacting editor promptly.