Please mark the appropriate space by typing an 'X' or N/A (not appropriate).

1. Scope

\_\_Of general relevance

\_\_Very relevant in the field of....................... : Visual Object Tracking

\_\_Very specialised

2. Information contained

\_\_New techniques/theory

\_\_New application of known concepts

\_\_Valuable confirmation of known techniques : X

\_\_Repetition of known material

\_\_Too theoretical

3. Conclusions drawn

\_\_Adequate : X

\_\_Not justified

\_\_Suffer from major omissions

\_\_Suffer from loose generalisations

4. Title

\_\_Adequately descriptive

\_\_Should be changed

5. Abstract

\_\_Clear and adequate : X

\_\_Should be rewritten

\_\_Missing

6. Language

\_\_Grammatically good : X

\_\_Needs revision

7. Presentation and style

\_\_Adequate : X

\_\_Too brief for clarity

\_\_Too comprehensive, must be shortened

\_\_Contains irrelevant material

\_\_Arrangement unsuitable; Could be better subdivided

8. Illustrations

\_\_Number and quality adequate

\_\_Fig(s) ...... may be omitted

\_\_A figure is desirable to illustrate

..................................................

\_\_Quality of prints/drawings inadequate

9 Tables

\_\_Adequate : X

\_\_Should be rearranged to represent data more clearly

\_\_Table ...... may be omitted

10 Abbreviations, formulae, units

\_\_Conform to acceptable norms : X

\_\_Do not conform with accepted standards; should be changed

\_\_Should be explained

11 Literature references

\_\_Adequate

\_\_Inadequate

\_\_.................. cannot be located

12 The paper is graded as

\_\_Excellent

\_\_Good : X

\_\_Acceptable

\_\_Sound, but dull

\_\_Confirmatory

\_\_Without obvious significance

\_\_Weak

\_\_Too speculative

\_\_Too preliminary

\_\_Outside this journal's scope

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

Please enter here any further information that is necessary before a decision can be made:

The below checklist covers the points made in the above review form, as well as other aspects which would need to be considered when making your assessment.

1. Scope

Is there an immediate "appeal" to a practising industrial engineer?

Is the title explicit, attractive and interesting?

Is the abstract clear and to the point, stressing both the specific application and the generic aspects of the work? yes

2.

Does the Introduction clearly state the application area? yes

3.

Is there real evidence of the practical industrial benefits of the technologies/methodologies introduced (e.g., where it was applied, and what improvements resulted)? yes

Does the Conclusion state these clearly? yes

4.

Are there generic aspects which make the work applicable beyond a narrow range of applications?

Are these clearly brought out in the paper?

5.

Is the paper correct technically?

6.

Is there some aspect, either in theory or application, which is new or innovative?

7.

Is the paper intelligible, but non-trivial, to a practising professional engineer in the field of intended application? yes

8. Is the paper intelligible, and of some relevance, to practising professional engineers in other fields?

9.

Is the paper easy to read, i.e.,

· Is it to the point? Yes

· Is it grammatically and semantically simple and correct? Yes

· Are the figures, graphs, etc., clear explicit and properly labelled?

· Are the mathematics essential? (Enough detail should be given so that numerical examples can be reproduced exactly, but mathematical proofs should be referenced, rather than spelt out in tedious detail.)

· Are the references complete, and relatively easy to obtain?

· Is the length appropriate? (Most papers will tend to be between 5 and 8 pages in length, but shorter or longer papers are acceptable if their lengths are appropriate to their contents.)

10.

Survey/review papers should be authoritative and of high quality.

11.

Finally,

Would the paper justify the time spent by a busy person in reading it?

Did you, the reviewer, learn something from it?