A Form for Referees in Theoretical Computer Science

1 For the Editor

TITLE: _____

AUTHORS: _____

NUMBER: _____ JOURNAL: _____

REFEREE: _____ EMAIL: _____

EDITOR: _____ EMAIL: _____

1.1 Recommendation

1 ☐ Accept
2 ☐ Accept, advise changes
3 ☐ Accept contingent on changes
4 ☐ Revise and re-referee
5 ☐ Combine with simultaneous paper
6 ☐ Cannot be refereed properly
7 ☐ Paper not publishable in this journal
8 ☐ Paper not publishable

1.2 The Referee

1.2.1 Competence of Referee

1 ☐ Expert
2 ☐ Well-versed
3 ☐ Interested
4 ☐ Competent

1.2.2 Confidence Level

1 ☐ Very confident
2 ☐ Confident
3 ☐ Reasonably confident

1.2.3 Effort Spent

1 ☐ Great
2 ☐ Reasonable
3 ☐ Minor
4 ☐ Almost none

1.2.4 Comprehension

1 ☐ Understand perfectly
2 ☐ Understand majority
3 ☐ Understand ideas
4 ☐ Slightly confused
5 ☐ Very confused

1.2.5 Details Checked

1 ☐ All details
2 ☐ Most details
3 ☐ Enough details
4 ☐ At a high level only

This form was designed and created by Ian Parberry, 1994. Pdf version created 2007. Last updated on September 20, 2007. Click on the fields in the pdf to enter your data, then email or print.

For Editor's Use Only
Date Issued:
Date Prepared:
Notes:

2 For the Author

2.1 The Results

2.1.1 Significance

1 ☐ Seminal
2 ☐ Interesting
3 ☐ Progress
4 ☐ Incremental progress
5 ☐ Ancient history
6 ☐ Mundane
7 ☐ Trivial
8 ☐ Cannot tell

2.1.2 Originality

1 ☐ Original
2 ☐ Simultaneous discovery
3 ☐ Small twist to known work
4 ☐ Already published by authors
5 ☐ Already published by others
6 ☐ Folk theorems

2.1.3 Proofs

1 ☐ Beautiful
2 ☐ Pretty
3 ☐ Serviceable
4 ☐ Ugly

2.1.4 Proof Techniques

1 ☐ Deep
2 ☐ Innovative
3 ☐ Clever
4 ☐ Elegant
5 ☐ Workmanlike
6 ☐ Simple
7 ☐ Trivial

2.1.5 Correctness

1 ☐ Correct
2 ☐ Correct beyond reasonable doubt
3 ☐ Probably correct
4 ☐ Probably incorrect
5 ☐ Proofs wrong
6 ☐ Results wrong
7 ☐ Cannot tell

2.2 The Paper

2.2.1 Accessibility

1 ☐ Expert
2 ☐ Specialist
3 ☐ Theoretical computer scientist
4 ☐ Computer scientist

2.2.2 Presentation

1 ☐ Almost flawless
2 ☐ Polished
3 ☐ Adequate
4 ☐ Rough
5 ☐ Incomprehensible

2.2.3 Density

1 ☐ Too long
2 ☐ Adequate
3 ☐ Terse
4 ☐ Too terse

2.2.4 Missing Details

1 ☐ Probably wrong
2 ☐ Often incomprehensible
3 ☐ Requires great effort
4 ☐ Requires effort
5 ☐ Requires small effort
6 ☐ Requires no effort
7 ☐ Too much detail

2.2.5 Technical Writing

	A	E	I	P	R	T	
1	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Excellent
2	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Good
3	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Adequate
4	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Substandard
5	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Inadequate
6	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Very bad
7	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	Missing

A: Abstract
E: Command of English
I: Introduction
P: Description of problem
R: References
T: Title