

Paper Review Form — IEEE Transactions on Power Electronics

Due Date for Review: \_\_\_\_\_  
(normally within 6 weeks after receipt of manuscript)

Reference Number: \_\_\_\_\_

Paper Title: \_\_\_\_\_

Thank you for your willingness to serve as a reviewer. Peer review is one of the most important activities of our Society, and your help is appreciated. *Written comments are usually the most helpful part of a review. Please provide comments on the second page or on separate sheets.* The grading section below is intended to help identify key points for written comments, and also to allow comparisons among different reviewers. A good paper should have a high overall score, but does not have to score well in all aspects to be acceptable. For example, a concise, critical review paper is a valuable publication, although it might have little intrinsic originality. A paper that introduces important new concepts might be valuable even with limited experimental work. A total score below 30, however, is typically grounds for rejection.

*Please note that prior publication in another archival journal, prior review for another IEEE Transactions, or overt commercialism will preclude acceptance of a paper. Please cite the source of such occurrences if possible.*

Basic Qualification Questions:

1. What is the new contribution of this paper? (Based on your assessment rather than on author statements.)
2. Does the contribution have good archival value, or is it only an incremental addition to existing knowledge?

Paper Grading (please circle the most appropriate number):

Original, elegant	5 4 3 2 1 0	Restatement of existing knowledge
Valuable for practicing engineers	5 4 3 2 1 0	Impractical or excessively commercial
Technically and mathematically accurate	5 4 3 2 1 0	Unsound; contains significant errors
Well supported with analysis and experimental evidence	5 4 3 2 1 0	Unproven, unsupported
Rich in engineering judgement and insight	5 4 3 2 1 0	Uninformed, amateurish
Clear, concise, effective presentation	5 4 3 2 1 0	Obscure, disorganized, verbose
Interesting to readers, stimulates new ideas	5 4 3 2 1 0	Uninteresting; topic is nearly cliché
Effective illustrations and tables	5 4 3 2 1 0	Poor figures or figures without discussion
Correct English usage	5 4 3 2 1 0	Weak grammar; difficult to follow
Useful references to past work	5 4 3 2 1 0	No context is provided beyond the authors' work

Total score \_\_\_\_\_

Recommendation (check one):

- Accept without change** – The paper can be published in its current form.
- Accept with suggested but not mandatory changes** – The paper can be published in its current form but could be made stronger by incorporating changes suggested by reviewers.
- Accept with mandatory changes** – The paper cannot be published in its current form, but can be provisionally accepted if the authors incorporate mandatory changes suggested by the reviewers. It is the opinion of the reviewers that the changes are relatively minor and can be incorporated in six weeks or less. (The reviewer may also *suggest* changes in which case the reviewer should differentiate between mandatory and suggested changes.)
- Do not accept** – The paper cannot be accepted in its current form. The reviewers should indicate why the paper cannot be accepted and suggest whether the paper could be acceptable after a major revision.

(Please Print Clearly)

Reviewer's Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Voice Telephone: \_\_\_\_\_ Fax Telephone: \_\_\_\_\_

Reviewer's Organization: \_\_\_\_\_

Reviewer's Postal Address: \_\_\_\_\_

Reviewer's E-mail Address: \_\_\_\_\_

Reviewer's Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

**Comments and suggestions for revisions**

Please indicate whether changes are mandatory or are optional suggestions. Use additional sheets if necessary. Type if possible, since this information will be sent to the authors.