## **CONFERENCE ON GAME INNOVATIONS**

## **REVIEW FORM**

TITLE OF THE PAPER: PROCEDURAL FRACTAL PLANTS GENERATION

AUTHOR(S): FILIP RYNKIEWICZ I IN.

#### TYPE OF PAPER

- a) research paper (with original results)
- b) case study
- c) position paper
- d) other (please specify)

#### **GENERAL EVALUATION**

a) relevance to the Conference scope

EXCELLENT, GOOD, FAIR, QUESTIONABLE, OUT OF SCOPE

.....

b) originality

EXCEPTIONAL, MAJOR, GOOD, QUESTIONABLE, PREVIOUSLY PUBLISHED

c) significance; usefulness

EXCEPTIONAL, MAJOR, GOOD, MINOR, NONE

d) reference to the related literature

THOROUGH, CORRECT, AMENDABLE, POOR, UNSUITABLE

e) presentation and paper organization

CLEAR & CONSISTENT, READABLE, AMENDABLE, ENIGMATIC, UNREADABLE

## **TECHNICAL SOUNDNESS**

a) Technically correct	(after careful check)
<ul><li>b) Apparently correct</li><li>c) Minor errors</li></ul>	(after superficial check) (please indicate them)
c) Willion errors	(piease indicate them)
d) Major arrara	(places indicate them)
d) Major errors  1) introduction does not fit	(please indicate them) nish with a clear problem statement and authors' contribution
	only in a head of chapter ("procedural systems") but it was not
	relation between L-systems and fractals and procedural approach
was explained.	clation between E systems and nactals and procedural approach
1	zier curves is not necessary as it provides well known theory,
	es the extension of Bezier curves – B-splines
	s not reveal of what type of methods authors think. Additionally
	with implementation issues. This must be corrected (rewrited) as
method chapter should be	separated from implementation issues.
	after some introduction concerning experiments background
	not acceptable at all as it does not satisfy any bibliography rules,
moreover not all of the lite	erature positions are cited in the manuscript
e) Unsupported claims	(please provide a detailed explanation):
e) Onsupported Claims	(piease provide a detailed explanation).
	LINGUISTIC QUALITY
a) warm good b) accom	
a) very good b) accep	table (minor errors as indicated) c) needs thorough correction
Comments:	
	athematics", "motivation of this topic", "produce way to procedural
	le in few seconds", "Most of the algorithms to create 3D tree mesh
	ity of plants as fractals", "L-system is all about changing one string
	", "which simply adding a line", "description of parameter, its
	e of object", "it's mean", "each result of implemented algorithm",
"world world forming tree	have"" sound a bit weird.
	istakes happen, i.e.: "variaty os usage", "L-system create(s)",
	ges was(were) made", "all the example(s)", "two rule(s)", "branch
	example have(has)", "make model looks like", "all string(s)"
Statement "in figure" is pr	obably more appropriate than "at figure"

# FINAL RECOMMENDATION

<ul><li>a) ACCEPT</li><li>b) ACCEPT WITH MAJOR CHANGES</li><li>c) REJECT</li><li>d) OUT OF SCOPE</li></ul>	(editorial changes necessary as point) (needs substantial changes and re-review) (unsuitable to publish in CGI proceedings) (should be re-directed to another journal)
For choice "ACCEPT" please indicate typos	
For choice "ACCEPT WITH MAJOR CHAN revised:	NGES" please indicate what need to be
In abstract statement concerning "imitation should be rather replaced with "modelling".	
	ted as a very complex fractal" is not proved
3) In 2.1 chapter the definition of "letter" ar	
were defined	neither discussed in the text nor its symbols
5) The review is inconsistent: chapters 2.1 a and 2.4 don't	and 2.2 provide rules and examples while 2.3
6) "can write application in C# using Mono means?	" is not understandable - what "Mono"
7) What does "structure" in statement "L-Sy structures" mean?	ystem was implemented with couple of simple
8) What do "quaternion and position" and "and name of object" really mean	description of parameter, its definition as float
9) Figure 3 has caption "ddd" – what does it	
10) Sentence "We can move our work to made using simple parametrized mathematical modelling software works" seems to be a technique let the user consciously operate.	equations, without even knowing how the ontroversial as understanding of the

## For choice "REJECT" please indicate the reason(s):

- 1) reject because it is not relevant to *CGI Proceedings* 2) reject because of the presentation

<ul><li>3) reject because the content is too premature</li><li>4) reject because of lack of originality (results already known; similar overview already published, etc.)</li></ul>
5) reject because of major errors (please indicate them)
For choice d) please propose journal(s) for which the paper would be more suitable
BLIND COMMENTS - VISIBLE FOR THE AUTHOR(S)
The sentences are evidently too long and grammatically not perfect