

# Review Criteria

## (1) Quality of the research, the results and the application prospects reported in the manuscript

- Are there new research results in the manuscript?
- How significant is the contribution?
- Does the contribution have a potential to stimulate further research in the area addressed?
- Does the contribution offer prospects for implementation?
- Is the manuscript well written? (English is only part of the issue).
- Is there a critical evaluation of the related work to establish novelty?
- Is the manuscript technically correct?
- Are the results properly validated by analytical/simulations/prototyping methods?

The reputation of the journal, and ultimately its success, depends on the quality of research presented in the published papers. A journal with high “reputation” will ultimately help the authors to attain higher visibility within the research community and, as a result, a larger number of citations. It is imperative the authors establish a claim to significant novelty by a critical evaluation of the most recent articles related to their claim, and provide an adequate bibliography. Of course, poorly written and out of scope papers are not acceptable.

## (2) Estimate the interest of readers

- Is the described subject of current interest to TII readers? (consider that this includes an industrial audience focused more on practical solutions and applicability)
- Is the title interesting and adequate?
- Is the abstract attracting attention?
- Is the length of manuscript adequate?
- Is the manuscript clearly written?

In the age of electronic publications it is not easy to be noticed (Industrial Electronics Society alone receives over 5,000 conference and journal papers per year). Therefore, very careful wording should be used in the title and in the abstract. Without a proper title and abstract a great paper might never be downloaded from IEEE Xplore and read. Often manuscripts receive negative reviews because reviewers are not able to understand the manuscript. This is the authors' (not the reviewers') fault. If reviewers have difficulties, then other readers will face the same problems and there will be no reason to publish the manuscript. Is the length of the manuscript adequate? Manuscripts should be written on the proper level. They should be easy to understand by qualified professionals working in industry, but at the same time, please avoid describing well known facts (use proper references instead). **Authors must do everything possible to ensure the paper will be noticed and read.**

## (3) Is the manuscript up-to-date and within the scope of TII?

- Are authors aware of recently published papers from journals and conference proceedings?
- Is the manuscript within the scope of the TII?

It is important that the authors show they have a good knowledge of the state-of-the-art in the subject area. Reviewers should ensure that authors refer to the most recent papers that are relevant to the research. Citations of textbooks and web pages should be used very rarely. If there is doubt about the scope of the manuscript the editor may recommend resubmission of the manuscript to another journal with a more closely related scope.

## Other problems:

### Plagiarism

The plagiarizing author can only count on very short term “gain” because within a year or two their act of plagiarism will become common knowledge and the consequences will be severe. With search engines available on the web it is now much easier to detect unacknowledged copying of original text. Enhanced interest in the paper citations, supported by the Science Citation Index and by Google Scholar, makes plagiarism more detectable and the number of reported incidents of alleged plagiarism is growing. We are, of course, expecting reviewers to report all signs of plagiarism.

#### The Five Levels of Plagiarism specified by IEEE

1. Uncredited verbatim copying of a full paper: results in a violation notice in the later article’s bibliographic record and a suspension of the offender’s IEEE publication privileges for up to five years.
2. Uncredited verbatim copying of a large portion (up to half) of a paper: results in a violation notice in the later article’s bibliographic record, and a suspension of publication privileges for up to five years.
3. Uncredited verbatim copying of individual elements such as sentences, paragraphs, or illustrations: may result in a violation notice in the later article’s bibliographic record. In addition, a written apology must be submitted to the original creator to avoid suspension of publication privileges for up to three years.
4. Uncredited improper paraphrasing of pages or paragraphs (by changing a few words or phrases or rearranging the original sentence order): calls for a written apology to avoid suspension of publication privileges and a possible violation notice in the later article’s bibliographic record.
5. Credited verbatim copying of a major portion of a paper without clear delineation of who did or wrote what. Requires a written apology, and to avoid suspension, the document must be corrected.