

Comment on “Article Title”

First A. Author, Second B. Author Jr., and Third C. Author, *Member, IEEE*

Abstract—In no more than 50 words, state the major contributions of the paper.

1 INTRODUCTION

Present a concise description of the article and your global evaluation of the work presented.

2 EVALUATION

Explain in detail how the article does or does not provide sufficient background information and literature review regarding its topic. Include in your assessment thoughts and recommendations as to how the author(s) could augment this area of the manuscript.

List and describe in detail any topic(s) or information related to the discussion in the article which appears to be missing. Please provide suggestions as to what topic(s) or information the author(s) could add to ensure that the scope of the article’s contents is complete.

Present a discussion as to whether or not the information in this article clearly illustrates the issues, problems, and trends related to the general chosen theme as well as to the particular title assigned. Include your constructive and analytical assessment and list suggestions for improvement and/or enhancement, identifying any serious over-emphasis or under-emphasis of issues or problems.

List the main weaknesses and strengths of the article with suggestions on how can the overall quality of the article be improved.

Provide your opinion on the organization of the article and the appropriateness of references used, particularly where quotes are used.

3 COMPLIANCE WITH AUTHOR GUIDELINES

Comment on the manuscript’s format, particularly concerning size, text size and line spacing, equations, units [1], figures and tables, captions and references.

4 GRADING

Considering the evaluation presented earlier, rate from 1 (poor) to 10 (excellent) the following aspects:

1. Theoretical or practical significance.
2. Organization of article.
3. Clarity of presentation.
4. Adequacy of background.
5. Adequacy of literature review.
6. Appropriate approach.
7. Adequacy of analysis of issues.

5 HELPFUL HINTS

Optionally, identify which aspects should be further explored in a future presentation and what questions were left unanswered in the manuscript.

6 CONCLUSION

Conclude your review by grading the article presented - from 1 (poor) to 10 (excellent) - and justifying that grade.

REFERENCES

- [1] NIST, “SI Unit rules and style conventions - Check List for Reviewing Manuscripts” available online at <http://physics.nist.gov/cuu/Units/checklist.html> since February 1998, last accessed June 2009.

- F.A. Author is with the National Institute of Standards and Technology, Boulder, CO 80305. E-mail: author@boulder.nist.gov.
- S.B. Author Jr. is with the Department of Physics, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, CO 80523. E-mail: author@colostate.edu.
- T.C. Author is with the Electrical Engineering Department, University of Colorado, Boulder, CO 80309. On leave from the National Research Institute for Metals, Tsukuba, Japan E-mail: author@nrim.go.jp.

Manuscript received (insert date of submission if desired). Please note that all acknowledgments should be placed at the end of the paper, before the bibliography.