Survey paper Review Form

Review items	Comment (free text):
Question 1. Title The title must reflect the contents of the paper. It should be informative and precise. It should be unique from the titles of other papers.	
Question 2. Abstract The abstract must reflect the contents of the paper. It must describe the a priori assumptions, the problems studied, the results, and the applications. It should be concise. It should neither be too long nor too short, approx 200-300 words. The abstract should preferably motivate the reader to read the whole paper.	
Question 3. Scope The scope of the paper must be well-defined. The scope of the paper could also define the limits of the paper, i.e. give the boundaries of the scope and areas that are not covered.	
Question 4. Related work and references The survey must adequately refer to and explain the conceptual contribution of the underlying papers, in particular the key papers. The survey must be properly referenced, i.e. pointing out other papers with relevance for the area. The survey should put itself into context, e.g. by referring to other relevant work (e.g. surveys) and describe similarities and differences with respect to the present survey.	
Question 5. Paper structure, organization, and style Terms and concepts must be clearly and correctly defined before they are used. The paper must be easy to read and understand. The logical reasoning and deduction must be clear and easy to follow. The paper must be properly illustrated. Illustrations must be explained and referred to in the text.	
Question 6. Technical contribution The survey paper must exhibit the technical contributions of the underlying set of papers and *draw some additional conclusions* based on the contributions in the underlying papers. The paper must be scientifically and technically sound. It must be free from scientific, technical and logical errors.	
Question 7. Length The paper length is adequate for its purpose, normally between 5000 and 7000 words	
Overall rating Give your general impression of the paper.	5. strong accept 4. accept 3. weak accept 2. weak reject 1. reject

Reviewer's confidence Have you looked at other papers that are discussed in the survey? Do you have other previous knowledge of the area? Do you understand the paper?	5. expert 4. high 3. medium 2. low 1. none
Some good things What should be preserved to the next revision?	Free text
Suggested changes What must definitely be changed to the next revision?	Free text
Language etc Indicate if there are syntactical or semantic problems with the paper, such as typos, grammatical errors, incorrect deduction, etc	Free text