



**Review Form**

**Data for questions in RED are required!**

<p><b>1. Scope:</b></p> <p>Is the subject matter suitable for an Antennas and Propagation Symposium conference publication?</p>	<p><input type="radio"/> Yes</p> <p><input type="radio"/> No</p>
<p>(Please elaborate in the provided text box below in case of negative answer; minimum 10 characters)</p> <hr/>	
<p><b>2. Novelty/Contribution:</b></p> <p><b>For research papers:</b> Does this paper include content with sufficiently novel contribution for publication in the AP-Symposium Proceedings?</p> <p><b>For review/overview papers or industry papers:</b> Does this paper include content with sufficient archival value or potential for technology transfer to be published in the AP-Symposium Proceedings?</p> <p><b>For “in celebration of” or “in memory of” papers:</b> Does the paper offer a useful perspective on the life or career of the person being celebrated?</p> <p><b>For 1-page abstracts submitted to URSI:</b> does the abstract make a convincing case for the proposed presentation?</p> <p>Grade novelty / potential for technology transfer / archival value on a scale of 1 (lowest) to 10 (outstanding) with 5 denoting an acceptable level.</p>	<p><input type="radio"/> 1 (lowest)</p> <p><input type="radio"/> 2</p> <p><input type="radio"/> 3</p> <p><input type="radio"/> 4</p> <p><input type="radio"/> 5 (acceptable)</p> <p><input type="radio"/> 6</p> <p><input type="radio"/> 7</p> <p><input type="radio"/> 8</p> <p><input type="radio"/> 9</p> <p><input type="radio"/> 10 (outstanding)</p>
<p><b>3. Significance:</b></p> <p>How important are the results presented in this paper for the AP-S Community?</p> <p>Grade significance on a scale of 1 (no significance) to 10 (outstanding significance), with 5 denoting an acceptable level of significance.</p>	<p><input type="radio"/> 1 (no significance)</p> <p><input type="radio"/> 2</p> <p><input type="radio"/> 3</p> <p><input type="radio"/> 4</p> <p><input type="radio"/> 5 (acceptable significance)</p> <p><input type="radio"/> 6</p> <p><input type="radio"/> 7</p> <p><input type="radio"/> 8</p> <p><input type="radio"/> 9</p> <p><input type="radio"/> 10 (outstanding significance)</p>
<p><b>4. Technical Correctness:</b></p> <p>Is the paper technically correct, as best you can determine?</p>	<p><input type="radio"/> Yes</p> <p><input type="radio"/> No</p>
<p>(Please elaborate in the provided text box below in case of negative answer; minimum 10 characters)</p> <hr/>	
<p><b>5. Clarity and Organization:</b></p> <p>Is the presentation appropriate and is the manuscript written in clear, idiomatic English?</p>	<p><input type="radio"/> Clear as is</p> <p><input type="radio"/> Needs improvement</p> <p><input type="radio"/> Unclear</p>
<p>(Please elaborate in the provided text box; minimum 10 characters)</p> <hr/>	
<p><b>6. Referencing:</b></p> <p>Are the references relevant to the topic discussed?</p>	<p><input type="radio"/> Yes</p> <p><input type="radio"/> No</p> <p><input type="radio"/> Not applicable</p>
<p>(Please elaborate in the provided text box in case of negative answer; minimum 10 characters)</p> <hr/>	
<p><b>7. Self-Referencing:</b></p> <p>Is the number of self-citations appropriate to describe previous work of the authors? (excessive self-citations can be reason for rejection)</p>	<p><input type="radio"/> Yes</p> <p><input type="radio"/> No</p> <p><input type="radio"/> Not applicable</p>
<p>(Please elaborate in the provided text box in case of negative answer; minimum 10 characters)</p> <hr/>	
<p><b>8. Overall Recommendation:</b></p> <p>Please provide a recommendation on this paper, noting that only very minor revisions are acceptable for final submission.</p>	<p><input type="radio"/> Reject</p> <p><input type="radio"/> Marginal reject</p> <p><input type="radio"/> Acceptable paper</p> <p><input type="radio"/> Excellent Paper</p> <p><input type="radio"/> Outstanding paper - The paper should be considered for an Award</p>
<p>The most important parts of your review are the written comments that will be transmitted to the author. In the space below, please give a straightforward assessment of the paper. In addition to the comments you provided above, please provide a technical appraisal of the reported work, with a minimum of 50 characters to ensure that feedback is provided to the authors.</p> <hr/>	
<p><b>9. Reviewer Confidence</b></p>	<p><input type="radio"/> The reviewer's evaluation is an educated guess.</p> <p><input type="radio"/> The reviewer is willing to defend the evaluation, but it is quite likely that the reviewer did not understand central parts of the paper.</p> <p><input type="radio"/> The reviewer is fairly confident that the evaluation is correct.</p> <p><input type="radio"/> The reviewer is confident but not certain that the evaluation is correct.</p> <p><input type="radio"/> The reviewer is certain that the evaluation is correct and very familiar with the relevant literature.</p>