

SIMHYDRO 2010

Criteria for evaluation of abstracts and papers

1. Criteria (for Authors and Reviewers)

Present call concerns two kinds of contribution:

- (i) Regular, “classic” papers to be presented, if accepted, mainly during 1st and 3rd days of the Conference (see leaflet for subjects); the subject of the papers must be one of those mentioned in the programme of the Conference (viz. leaflet); this subject is to be indicated in the summary and full paper (viz. template).
- (ii) Presentations during 2nd day discussions and round tables of specific subjects, projects and problems from practice and valuable for exchanges between modelling and decision-making communities as well as for hydroinformatics applications.

N.B.: Summaries and full papers are to be presented for acceptance for the first category (i). Only summaries containing description of the subject and willingness to present it in few minutes during a round table or a floor discussion are required for (ii) category: mainly to help the organisers in preparing specific sessions and conditions of thematic discussions and encounters.

Length of summary: complying with provided template.

For category (i) full manuscript length: complying with provided template.

For category (i) the topic addressed in the manuscript should be identical to that of the accepted summary. It is understood however that new results may have been obtained between summary submission and full length manuscript submission. Consequently, corresponding modifications in the paper conclusions and/or theoretical developments are acceptable.

Manuscripts, the topic of which are seen to have undergone substantial changes since summary submission, may be considered as new submissions and might be rejected if not deemed appropriate to the conference topics.

For category (ii) the subjects of presentations or proposed themes of discussions-exchanges might be rejected if not deemed appropriate to the conference topics.

Full manuscripts of papers presented for 1st and 3rd day should report significant information or advances in the fields of concern. The application examples should be sufficiently documented in such a way that the readers can apply described methodology or tools to their own problems. In case of lack of space for description, a hyperlink to an electronic longer version or to a web-site where such description is available should be supplied.

Model and/or algorithm applications should be sufficiently documented to allow the performance of the applications to be fully understood by the reader (both in terms of computational demand and data requirements).

2. Review Form for summary (for Reviewers only)

N.B.: concerns both (i) and (ii) categories

- 2.a. Does the summary topic fall within the pre-defined conference topics? Y/N
2.a.1 If yes, is it acceptable for publication in the conference proceedings ? Y/N
2.a.2 If no, please list the conference topic(s) to which the summary is the closest
- 2.b. Is the work reported of sufficient interest for publication in the conference proceedings :
- in view of the general criteria given above for Authors and Reviewers? Y/N
- in view of general Hydro-informatics state of the art? Y/N
- 2.c. If not, should poster submission be encouraged?

Total mark for point 2 (1= rejected, 2=poster suggested, 3= accepted)

3. Review Form for full manuscript (for Reviewers only)

3.1 Relevance

- 3.1.a Does the full manuscript correspond to the topics addressed in the summary ? Y/N
3.1.b Does the full manuscript falls within the conference topics? Y/N
3.1.b.1 If yes, is it acceptable for publication in the conference proceedings ? Y/N
3.1.b.2 If no, please list the conference topic(s) to which the summary is the closest
- 3.1.c Does the manuscript report significant information, scientific, methodological or technical progress or information in the field of concern ? Y/N

Total mark for point 3.1 (1= bad, unacceptable, 2=average, acceptable, 3= good and above normal, to be accepted)

3.2 Content

- 3.2.a Is the title adequate? Y/N
3.2.b Are the summary and material suitable? Y/N
3.2.c Is adequate reference made to other works in the field? Y/N
3.2.d Are any points of the paper or any illustrations unnecessary? Y/N
3.2.e Can any material be deleted without detriment? Y/N

Total mark for assessment of point 3.2 (1= bad, unacceptable, 2=average, acceptable, 3= good and above, to be accepted)

3.3 Formal assessment

- 3.3.a Is the French/English good enough to be understood by the readers? Y/N
- 3.3.b Is the text clear ? Y/N
- 3.3.c Are the figures correctly commented, referred to in the text and clear? Y/N
- 3.3.d Is the paper correctly referenced? Y/N

Total mark for assessment of point 3.3 (1= bad, unacceptable, 2=average, acceptable, 3= good and above)

3.4 Global marking

Global mark for the paper (1= bad, unacceptable, 2=average, acceptable, 3= good and above, to be accepted)

3.5 CONCLUSION

Rejection Y/N

Proposed for acceptance Y/N

Exception: Return to the author for clarification or modification if the paper seems to contain exceptional ideas, findings, results that are poorly presented (language, figures, style, etc.)

oOo