

IEEE ENGINEERING IN MEDICINE AND BIOLOGY SOCIETY

GUIDE FOR REVIEWERS

Preliminary Update, Dec 2000

Thank you for agreeing to review the above mentioned manuscript. Per your agreement with the Associate Editor, you have agreed to complete the review within **FOUR WEEKS** of the email date. Reminders of deadlines will be sent automatically from the Manuscript Central (Publications Office) in pursuit of this deadline. Any questions you may have about this manuscript or the review process should be directed to the Associate Editor. Please refer to the Manuscript Number in **ALL** correspondence or phone contacts with the Associate Editor or the EMBS Publications Office. Please go to the Manuscript Central website at

<http://embs-ieee.manuscriptcentral.com/>

or to the EMBS website

<http://www.embs.org>

to find instructions to create an account and electronically submit your review. Once you login, you can access an electronic version of the manuscript for your perusal.

You are required to **COMPLETE** the electronic review form in Manuscript Central. If you think it is absolutely necessary to forward to the author annotated pages of the manuscript, you can either scan your comments and include them in Manuscript Central as comments to the AE, email them to the AE, or mail the comments to the EMBS Office to be scanned in and forward to the authors.

Remember that manuscripts should not grow appreciably after a review, and when appropriate probably should contract a bit. Authors should not state the obvious in their papers, but only refer to established science by providing a reference. The desirable published manuscript length is 7 pages (10 for TNSRE), so please help the author identify, through your review, how the paper can be improved to save space while still making full scientific disclosure.

The review categories are self-explanatory. However, three criteria are **NECESSARY** for a recommendation of acceptance for publication: **NOVELTY** (new science or a new approach to established science) **QUALITY** (technical content is accurate) and **APPROPRIATENESS** (a manuscript that is complete in and of itself, and a good "fit" with the transactions to which it was submitted). If you find that a manuscript would be a better match in another EMBS publication, you should so advise the AE.

You are to score the manuscript according to the following codes:

A = Manuscript is ready for publication as is.

MiR = Manuscript is almost ready for publication; the author should be required to make some small amendments as noted in section 8 of the review form. The amended manuscript will not be returned to the reviewers.

MaR = Manuscript requires some major changes by the author, and must be returned to the reviewers for a second review round.

R = Manuscript should be rejected.

Confidential recommendations to the AE can be entered in the electronic form (section 6). Sometimes a more informal judgement about the paper summarizes better a more technical evaluation, and you should share your ideas privately with the AE.

Please provide detailed comments to the author in the electronic form (section 8). A good review will guide the effort of the author in amending the manuscript and preparing it for publication; or in the event of a score of R, that will help the author understand why the manuscript is considered unworthy for publication at this time. In completing this and all sections of the form, please be courteous to the authors, even if you may have formed some strong negative opinions about the manuscript.

Please note that the major revision category (MaR) adds substantially to the mean length of the review cycle, so you should ponder if the corrections can be done in 45 days, or if it is preferable to reject the manuscript and recommend resubmission. Reviews of manuscripts submitted to the transactions are "blind" reviews, and the identity of every reviewer is carefully protected.

Finally, please update the contact information in Manuscript Central, so that we can keep our database current, in the event the Associate Editor recommends a second round of reviews.

The EMBS appreciates your willingness to act as a reviewer and will do everything possible so that you are not overwhelmed with review requests. Our goal, to the extent we can control such requests, is to allow you to complete one review before requesting your further participation.

Once again, thanks for serving as a reviewer for the transactions of the IEEE EMB Society. Your participation adds value to the peer review process.