

Typical complaints of reviewers

- (1) **Wrong format** – Manuscript is not in the IEEE double column format.
- (2) **Authors' names or affiliation are shown in the text of manuscript.** Please do not submit the cover letter because your names can be identified. If possible submit only one PDF file with manuscript (and with response to reviewers if this is a revision).
- (3) **Manuscript is not within the scope of the journal.** Please notice that each journal has limited areas (scope) where it can provide a high quality review. A large portion of our reviewer database is automatically created by the Manuscript Central, and it consists primarily of authors of recently published papers in TII. Our experience tells us that if we ask people not associated with TII to evaluate manuscripts then in most cases we will not receive high quality reviews. Often they refuse to provide a review. Those individuals who do agree provide reviews without proper depth. Therefore, in order to receive a more competent and more objective review of your manuscript, please consider submitting your manuscript to the journal with more adequate scope.
- (4) **Manuscript has placed its finding in the content of conference papers, web pages, and textbooks instead of journal papers.** This is OK but only for work published at conferences but not in journals.
- (5) **Authors are citing primarily their own papers.** It could mean that:
 - authors live in their own bubble,
 - or they do not follow the literature,
 - or there are no papers on the subject by other authors, and this indicates that the world community is not interested in the subject.In all cases it would be difficult to expect a significant number of downloads and citations of the manuscript, and there is not much justification of publishing the manuscript.
- (6) **Manuscript is too theoretical for the industrial audience.** Please be aware that TII is directed to the industrial audience, which looks for practical applications and advanced mathematics. Lemmas, proofs, and theorems will not create a lot of enthusiasm among the TII readers. To be considered for TII, the manuscript should be significantly rewritten, and experimental verification of the theory is essential.

- (7) **Manuscript is outdated.** By the time of publication, the most current journal reference would already be a couple years old. Notice that the world community is ranking journals based on two-years-old journal references (Impact Factor calculations). Therefore, if a paper with 2 years or older references is published, it may not even be considered in the journal ranking analysis.
- Also, if authors are not able to link their research with recent journal papers it could mean:
- That authors do not follow current literature;
 - That there is not much interest in the presented research.
- Both are good reasons to reject a manuscript.
- (8) **Most of the findings of the manuscript were already published by other authors.** TII is publishing post-conference papers, but new results are expected there.
- (9) **Manuscript is too long.** An 8 page limit was introduced in 2005 (<http://tii.ieee-ies.org/o/TIICover4.pdf>). There is of course an option for authors to pay \$160 per additional page, but currently each page costs the Society well over \$200. A part of the cost can be recovered by the Society from XPLORE downloads, but reviewers should be sure that these longer papers will create a wide interest.
- (10) **There is no novelty.** Proposed solutions were already published and what is presented in the manuscript is only a small incremental step in the comparison of the existing knowledge. This is probably most obvious reason for rejection because we are expecting a new results in all publications (this includes both journals and conferences).
- (11) **Authors did not clearly describe their findings.** A common complaint from authors is that reviewers did not understand their papers. However, this is the authors' fault. If reviewers cannot understand the paper then other TII readers may face the same difficulties.
- (12) **Results were not experimentally verified.** It would be nice to have experimental verification in every paper, but sometimes it is not possible. Authors should at least try to verify their findings by extensive computer modeling. It would be difficult to expect that reviewers have a capacity to check correctness of all mathematical derivations.
- (13) **Manuscript is plagiarized.** Notice that every submitted manuscript is being check for plagiarism by very advanced software. This tool indicates all fragments which were copied from other papers. If certain sequences of words occur in several other papers then it is OK. However, if such sequences are identical to only one other paper (especially on the same subject) then the manuscript not only must be rejected, but we are required to start the process of putting authors on the "IEEE Prohibited Authors List" (currently it includes about 450 names).