

CSCE 790 Power-conscious Computing -- Referee Report

Paper Number: _____ Reviewer's Name: _____

Name of Paper: _____

Author(s): _____

Section I. Overview

A. Reader Interest

1. Which category describes this manuscript?

- Practice / Application / Case Study / Experience Report
- Research / Technology
- Survey / Tutorial / How-To

2. How relevant is this manuscript to the readers of this periodical? Please explain your rating under IIIA.

- Very Relevant
- Relevant
- Interesting - but not very relevant
- Irrelevant

B. Content

1. Please explain how this manuscript advances this field of research and / or contributes something new to the literature. Please explain your answer under IIIA. Public Comments.

2. Is the manuscript technically sound? Please explain your answer under IIIA. Public Comments.

- Yes
- Appears to be - but didn't check completely
- Partially
- No

C. Presentation

1. Are the title, abstract, and keywords appropriate? Please explain your answer under IIIA. Public Comments.

- Yes
- No

2. Does the manuscript contain sufficient and appropriate references? Please explain your answer under IIIA.

- References are sufficient and appropriate
- Important references are missing; more references are needed
- Number of references are excessive

3. Does the introduction state the objectives of the manuscript in terms that encourage the reader to read on? Please explain your answer under IIIA. Public Comments.

- Yes
- Could be improved
- No

4. How would you rate the organization of the manuscript? Is it focused? Is the length appropriate for the topic? Please explain your answer under IIIA. Public Comments.

- Satisfactory
- Could be improved
- Poor

5. Please rate and comment on the readability of this manuscript. Please explain your answer under IIIA.

- Easy to read
- Readable - but requires some effort to understand
- Difficult to read and understand
- Unreadable

Section II. Summary and Recommendation

A. Evaluation

Please rate the manuscript. Please explain your answer under IIIA. Public Comments.

- Award Quality
- Excellent
- Good
- Fair
- Poor

B. Recommendation

Please make your recommendation. Please explain your answer under IIIA. Public Comments.

- Accept with no changes
- Author should prepare a minor revision
- Author should prepare a major revision for a second review
- Reject

Section III. Detailed Comments

A. Public Comments (these will be made available to the author)

Explanation for the Recommendation

Summary of the Paper and Assessment

- What is the hypothesis?
- What methodology is used?
- What is the context/related work/background material?
 - Is it sufficient?
- What are the results?
 - Do they support the hypothesis?
 - What questions remain and why?
 - What new questions have been raised?
- What are the weaknesses?
 - in method?
 - in results?
 - how could this paper be improved?

What is the intellectual merit of the work?

- Why was it challenging?
- Why was it necessary?

What is the impact/significance of the work?

- Who/what stands to benefit?