

Review Form of ICCIS 2021

<http://www.iccis.org/>

Paper ID : IS028

Paper Title : A study based on Successive Approximation ADC

Evaluation:					
	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Outstanding
Originality	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Innovation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
technical merit	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
applicability	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Presentation and English	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Match to Conference Topic	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Recommendation to Editors					
	Strongly Reject	Reject	Marginally Accept	Accept	Strong Accept
Recommendation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

I. REVIEW

A. Suitability of topic

1. Is the topic appropriate for publication?

☐ Yes ☒ Perhaps ☐ No

2. Is the topic important to colleagues working in the field?

☐ Yes ☒ Perhaps ☐ No

B. Contents

1. Is the paper technically sound? If no, why not?

☒ Yes ☐ No

--

2. Is the coverage of the topic sufficiently comprehensive and balanced?
- ☐ Yes
☒ Important Information is missing or superficially treated.
☐ Treatment somewhat unbalanced, but not seriously so.
☐ Certain parts significantly overstressed.
3. How would you describe the technical depth of the paper?
- ☒ Superficial
☐ Suitable for the non-specialist
☐ Appropriate for the generally knowledgeable individual working in the field
☐ Suitable only for an expert
4. How would you rate the technical novelty of the paper?
- ☐ Novel ☐ Somewhat Novel ☒ Not Novel

C. Presentation

1. How would you rate the overall organization of the paper?
- ☐ Satisfactory ☐ Could be improved ☐ Poor
2. Are the title and abstract satisfactory?
- ☐ Yes ☒ No
-
3. Is the length of the paper appropriate? If not, recommend how the length of the paper should be amended, including a possible target length for the final manuscript
- ☒ Yes ☐ No
-
4. Are symbols, terms, and concepts adequately defined?
- ☐ Yes ☒ Not always ☐ No
5. How do you rate the English usage?
- ☐ Satisfactory ☒ Needs improvement ☐ Poor
6. How do you rate the list of references?
- ☐ Satisfactory ☒ Unsatisfactory
-

D. Overall rating (circle appropriate rating)

1. How would you rate the technical contents of the paper?
- ☐ Excellent ☐ Good ☒ Fair ☐ Poor
2. How would you rate the novelty of the paper?
- ☐ Highly Novel ☐ Sufficiently Novel ☐ Slightly Novel ☒ Not Novel
3. How would you rate the "literary" presentation of the paper?

☐ Totally Accessible ☐ Mostly Accessible ☒ Partially Accessible ☐ Inaccessible

4. How would you rate the appropriateness of this paper for publication?

☐ Excellent Match ☐ Good Match ☒ Weak Match ☐ Poor Match

II. RECOMMENDATION

- ☐ Publish unaltered
- ☐ Publish In Minor, Required Changes
- ☐ Publish After Major Required Changes
- ☒ Review Again After Major Changes
- ☐ Reject (Paper Is Not Of Sufficient Quality or Novelty To Be Published In This Conference)
- ☐ Reject (A Major Rewrite Is Required; Encourage Resubmission)
- ☐ Reject (Paper Is Seriously Flawed; Do Not Encourage Resubmission.)

III. COMMENTS

Please state the reason you gave the recommendation above. Please give the author specific guidance regarding revisions, differentiating between optional and mandatory changes. (Within 50-100 words)

1. Please follow the conference template when prepare the manuscript.
2. Capitalize proper nouns.
3. It is only a review of Successive Approximation ADC, almost content is existing research. The proposed research is not innovative.
4. The revolution of all figures should be improved. Presently they are unreadable.
5. The logical structure of the full paper needs to be improved.
6. Almost references are out dated. They also lead the poor novelty of the article.