

JOURNAL OF ELECTROSTATICS

Mark N. Horenstein, Editor
Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, Boston University
Boston, MA 02215 (USA)
telephone: (617) 353-2800, fax: (617) 353-5929, internet: mnh@bu.edu

REFeree REPORT

Authors:

Title:

General Criteria

- | | | |
|---|-----|----|
| • Is paper in scope of the journal? | yes | no |
| • Are the objectives clearly stated? | yes | no |
| • Does the paper represent original work? | yes | no |
| • Does the summary accurately reflect the contents of the paper? | yes | no |
| • Is this paper clearly written and well-organized? | yes | no |
| • Are the figures of journal quality? | yes | no |
| • Are the references adequate and in the correct form? | yes | no |
| • Are the grammar, spelling, and punctuation adequate? | yes | no |
| • Is this paper likely to be of special interest to the journal readership? | yes | no |

Overall rating

Rate this paper against others in the *Journal of Electrostatics* using the scale from 1 to 6 (circle one):

- | | |
|---|--|
| 6 | (= truly outstanding paper, worthy of special recognition) |
| 5 | (= excellent paper, very well-executed and presented work) |
| 4 | (= above average paper) |
| 3 | (= average paper) |
| 2 | (= below average paper, acceptable only with major revision) |
| 1 | (= very poor paper) |

Recommendation

- Accept (no revision required)
- Accept with some revision required, as specified on the reverse side of this page.
- Accept with major revisions, as specified on the reverse side of this page, and a second review.
- Reject for reasons stated on the reverse side of this page. Please be very specific.

Please see the reverse side of this form.

The written evaluation is as important to the editor as any of the answers to the questions on the reverse side of this form. Only with a written commentary can the editor (i) judge how closely a reviewer has read the paper and (ii) formulate a response to the sometimes conflicting opinions of different reviewers. In the space below, or on a separate sheet, please provide a detailed discussion of the strengths and weaknesses of this manuscript. As a courtesy to the author(s), please suggest changes that, if made, will improve the paper. Also, please distinguish between suggested and required changes. If you have editorial suggestions, mark them on the manuscript and return it with this form.

Written evaluation

reviewer name (please type or print): _____

signature: _____ date: _____

Key word request

Please provide a few key words useful for indexing this paper.