

# ENGINEERING & TECHNOLOGY REFERENCE REVIEWER GUIDE

---

## Information for reviewers of articles submitted to the Engineering & Technology Reference

The Engineering & Technology (E&T) Reference is a peer reviewed, online collection of multidisciplinary technical articles and case studies designed to help engineers, researchers and students solve their technical challenges and improve engineering 'know-how'.

The E&T Reference requires that articles be subject to peer-review prior to acceptance for publication. This ensures that a high standard of publication is maintained by identifying material that is significant, practical and well presented. The IET has an international authorship and readership and our reviewers are selected carefully to reflect this.

We value the work of our reviewers and recognise that you are very busy and dedicated people. For IET members - reviews completed count towards Continuous Professional Development (CPD) under the IET CPD Monitoring Scheme.

We are always interested to hear from you, especially regarding your views on how we can provide you with the best possible service. To help us do this we encourage you to alert us to the following:

- changes in your contact details
- periods of unavailability (e.g. holidays, sabbaticals)
- changes in your research interests

If you find that you are no longer able to review, you should contact the **editorial office**.

## THE REVIEW PROCESS

The IET uses an online system 'ScholarOne Manuscripts' to process peer reviews. Reviewers will receive instructions in how to use the system when an invitation is accepted.

The review process is used to maintain a high level of quality within our reviews. Peer review is a system of evaluating a piece of work by the author's peers, who are of similar competence and understanding. It is a way of self-regulating the field and determining an article's suitability for publication.

An article is sent to two or more reviewers who judge its suitability. Once reviewers have completed the review, the Editor examines the reviewer's comments and, based on those comments, makes a decision. For E&T Reference there are three possible decisions: Accept; Accept with minor revision; or Decline.

## POLICY AND CONFIDENTIALITY

- All submissions should be given unbiased consideration regardless of race, gender, ethnic origin, affiliation or religion of the authors.
- Your review should be objective; please **do not** make comments about the article or authors that could cause offence.
- All reviews are single-blind, i.e. although you as a reviewer know who the authors are, your anonymity to the author (s) is strictly preserved.
- Please **do not** correspond with or transmit your review directly to the authors. Please use the 'Comments to Editor' field to make any comments that you do not wish the author to see. Any comments made in the 'Comments to Author' field will be transmitted to the author.
- **Please treat the article as confidential.**
- Please inform the editor if you believe the authors to have infringed the following policy: IET Policy in Relation to Plagiarism, Infringement of Copyright and Infringement of Moral Rights and Submission to Multiple Publications.

## CONFLICT OF INTEREST

Your review should be objective. Please contact us immediately if:

- you are in direct competition with the authors
- you are/have been a co-worker or collaborator with any of the authors

## CONTENT

The editors encourage the publication of articles that demonstrate practical application to the subject. If the article does not contain a case study or lessons learned, this should be stated.

## ORIGINALITY

Articles submitted to the E&T Reference should not be under review elsewhere. If you suspect that an article is undergoing the process of peer review and/or has been published in another publication, please contact the IET E&T Reference **editorial office** with your concerns.

## UPDATED ARTICLES

Articles submitted to the E&T Reference are eligible to be updated online. If you are chosen to review one of these updated articles, you will be alerted via the ScholarOne system.

## REVIEW FORMS

The IET use the web-based peer review system Manuscript Central from ScholarOne. When you have been invited to review an article you will receive an email containing details including the title, authors and abstract of the article. At the end of the email there will be a link for each response type; accept, decline, decline due to no time and decline due to the article being out of your research field. Upon acceptance of the invitation you will receive a confirmation email that will contain a link to the review form where you will be able to access the complete version of the article.

There are two ways for you to view the manuscript assigned to you. You can click either of the "PDF" links at the top of the table and print the resulting PDF proof. You can also read directly from the screen by clicking the "HTML" link at the top of the table and viewing the resulting HTML proof.

The review forms first contain a number of questions related to the scope, originality, references and presentation of the article. If any of your answers to these questions need further explanation there is the chance to write comments in the Comments to Editor or Comments to Author section.

The category drop down list allows you to give an overall opinion of the article, whether you believe that the article is unsuitable for publication (erroneous, trivial or not significant), whether the article is interesting and of use but needs improving (outstanding work of great significance, good and useful advance) or whether you believe the article can be accepted as it currently is and needs no further work (acceptable for publication).

There is the option to upload files alongside any comments on the review form, please make sure that they are referred to in the Comments to Author or Comments to Editor box and successfully uploaded before submitting your article. If the files are for the authors' reference please make sure they do not contain your name, this includes the comment boxes on pdfs and any file names.

# PEER REVIEWER GUIDE

Please respond to all fields. The required fields that **must** be filled in before you can complete the review are:

- Please rate the article by choosing a category from the following list
- Recommendation
- Comments to Author

Please do not forget to select 'Submit' when you have completed the form and wish to send the review to the Editor.

This drop down allows you to rate the significance of the article. If you believe that it is inappropriate for the article to be published then you should select from 'Not significant, Trivial or Erroneous'. However, if you feel that it is worth being published but needs improvement then select, 'Outstanding work of great significance or Good and useful advance'. If you feel that it can be published as it is and needs no improvement then please select, 'Acceptable for publication'. This is a required field. You **must** select an option to complete the review.

It is important that the author demonstrates practical applications for the article as it is for practitioner engineers.

If you feel that the article requires a case study or lessons learnt, if possible, please elaborate in one of the comments boxes.

As the Engineering & Technology Reference is a new product, it would be useful to us if you could provide us with contact details of subject matter experts you know and who you feel maybe interested in peer reviewing for us.

This is a required field. You **must** check one of these to complete the review.

If you have any comments for the Editor that you do NOT want the Author to see, please use this box and it will remain confidential.

The author will receive these comments. Please make no reference to yourself in this, as the review **must** remain blind. This is a required field. To complete the review this **must** be filled in.

You may write any comments up in a word document and upload them here. If you do this you can select whether or not these are questions just for the Editor or if you would like the Author to be able to view them as well.

Should you wish to save your review and come back to it at a future point, please click "Save as draft".

To submit your review, please select 'Submit'. Until you click "submit" your review will not be final and will not be submitted. As soon as you are sure you want to submit your review, you **MUST** click "Submit".

[Instructions](#) | [Details](#) | [Score Sheet](#)

Title: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Manuscript ID: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Authors: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Manuscript Type: Reference Article  
 Date Submitted: 25-Sep-2014 (Last Updated: 25-Sep-2014)  
 Total Time in Review: 26 days, 23 hours

Status: EO: Howell, Alyssa  
 \* Under Review

PDF Abstract

---

### Engineering & Technology Reference Reviewer Report Form

Please indicate your ability to review this article (%)

**req** Please rate the article by choosing a category from the following list

Is the subject matter suitable for publication in this reference work? (If NO, please suggest alternative journals in the Comments to Editor section below)	<input type="text" value="Select..."/> <input type="text" value="Select..."/> Outstanding work of great significance Good and useful advance Acceptable for publication Not significant Trivial Erroneous	
Is this article relevant, appropriate, up-to-date and informative for the intended market? (If no, please state why in the comments box)	<input type="radio"/> Yes	<input type="radio"/> No
Are the references adequate? (Please use 'Comments to Author' section to suggest further references)	<input type="radio"/> Yes	<input type="radio"/> No
Is the length of the paper suitable? If no, please make any suggestions in the Comments to Author section)	<input type="radio"/> Yes	<input type="radio"/> No
Is the author's style readable and engaging?	<input type="radio"/> Yes	<input type="radio"/> No

---

### Presentation

Has the author demonstrated practical application?	<input type="radio"/> Yes	<input type="radio"/> No
Is the manuscript organised to show clearly what has been done?	<input type="radio"/> Yes	<input type="radio"/> No
Is the use of English clear and unambiguous?	<input type="radio"/> Yes	<input type="radio"/> No
If the paper does not contain a case study or lessons learnt, should it?	<input type="radio"/> Yes	<input type="radio"/> No
Is the artwork (diagrams, figures, illustrations) suitable for publication?	<input type="radio"/> Yes	<input type="radio"/> No

If you know of any colleagues who would be interested in becoming a referee for IET's Engineering and Technology Reference, please enter their contact details below:

Comments to the Editor are for the Editor only and will not be passed on to the author. Please use the 'Comments to Author' box for any comments that can be passed to the author.

Please use the Comments to Editor and/or Author to give guidance on revision or reasons for rejection. Alternatively you may upload your comments in a file.

Please ensure that the Comments to Author can be passed onto the author(s) without identifying you or your organisation. Apart from basic technical content, you may wish to give advice on the order of presentation, ways to shorten the paper, the adequacy of references etc.

---

**req** Recommendation

Accept  
 Accept with Minor Revision  
 Reject

---

### Comments

Confidential Comments to the Editor

**req** Comments to the Author

---

**Attach a File** | **Files attached**

Choose File | No file chosen | Attach | • No files have been uploaded.

Save as Draft |  Submit |  Print Saved Version

## PRESENTATION

- Reviewers are asked to consider whether the author presents the material logically, in clear and direct English, and in as concise a manner as possible. Please note: the IET “house style” is British English, spelling, grammar and punctuation.
- Reviewers are asked to consider most carefully whether any article can be shortened, if required, and to give instructions as to how this may be achieved. For example, reviewers may be asked to consider whether all the mathematics are essential or whether parts can be deleted
- SI units, and ISO and IEC recommended unit symbols, letter symbols and nomenclature should be used throughout. Reviewers should indicate where other units have been used.
- The illustrations supplied to the reviewer should be sufficiently clear for easy assessment but need not be of sufficient quality for reproduction (authors are asked to submit high-quality material for production upon acceptance).
- Graphs and other illustrations should be clearly drawn and labelled. Graphs are an effective method of displaying results although too much information in one graph can cause confusion, and may not be easily reproducible in production. Tabular information should not duplicate graphical information.

## DECISIONS

If there is sufficient agreement between the reviewers, the editor will make one of the following decisions:

- the article is accepted outright
- the article is accepted subject to minor revisions being made
- the article is rejected outright

If the authors are asked to improve or modify their article, the editor may return the article to the original reviewers, for further review, once modified.

If you have any queries, please contact the editorial office: [engref@theiet.org](mailto:engref@theiet.org)

[www.ietdl.org/etr](http://www.ietdl.org/etr)