ADM Scientific Manuscript Review and Evaluation Grid

Criterion 1: State of the Art and Bibliography

Score | Description

5 - Comprehensive and Exhaustive: The literature review is thorough and well-structured. The article cites all relevant sources, including the most recent and significant ones, demonstrating an excellent understanding of the state of the art. The connections to the proposed work are clearly articulated.

4 - Good: The bibliography is solid and well-contextualized. While some secondary references may be missing, it adequately covers the most important and recent works. The connections to the proposed research are generally well-justified.

3 - Acceptable: The literature review is sufficient but has some gaps. Important references may be missing, or the link between the state of the art and the proposed work could be clearer and more articulated.

2 - Weak: The coverage of the state of the art is insufficient. Essential references are missing, connections to the proposed research are vague or non-existent, and the understanding of the scientific context is superficial.

1 - Inadequate: The literature review is severely lacking or non-existent. The article ignores fundamental research in the field, presents an outdated or irrelevant bibliography, and does not demonstrate an adequate understanding of the state of the art.

Criterion 2: Contribution/Significance

Score | Description

5 - Outstanding: The article presents a groundbreaking contribution that significantly advances the field of study. It introduces innovative concepts, methodologies, or results with high impact and broad applicability.

4 - Strong: The article offers a significant contribution with notable advancements. While not groundbreaking, it provides valuable insights, methodologies, or applications that bring substantial benefits to the scientific community.

3 - Moderate: The article presents a moderate contribution with incremental improvements or refinements to existing work. The significance is limited, but it may still be useful for researchers in the field.

2 - Weak: The contribution is marginal, with few new insights or improvements over previous work. The impact is low, and the relevance of the results is questionable.

1 - Minimal: The article does not provide a significant contribution. It may be a reproduction of known results, an insignificant variation of existing work, or an analysis lacking scientific value.

Criterion 3: Technical Soundness

Score | Description

5 - Excellent: The methodology and analyses are rigorous, well-justified, and free of obvious errors. The hypotheses are solid, experiments or demonstrations are well-executed, and the results are reproducible and well-supported.

4 - Good: The article presents solid methodology and analysis, with only minor inaccuracies or areas for improvement. The hypotheses and results are generally well-founded but could benefit from further details or refinements.

3 - Acceptable: The methodology is generally valid but has some gaps or weaknesses. There may be debatable assumptions, partially justified results, or analyses that require further depth to ensure full reliability.

2 - Weak: The methodological approach is flawed, with significant errors or insufficient justification. Experiments or demonstrations have gaps, and results are unclear or difficult to reproduce.

1 - Insufficient: The article presents serious technical problems, obvious methodological errors, or inconsistent analyses. The results are unreliable or unverifiable, compromising the overall validity of the work.

Criterion 4: Organization and Clarity

Score | Description

5 - Excellent: The article is well-structured, clear, and easy to follow. Sections are logically organized with smooth transitions. The language is precise and well-written, without ambiguities. Tables, figures, and references are appropriate and enhance comprehension.

4 - Good: The presentation is clear and well-organized, with only minor structural or coherence issues. Some sections could be made smoother or more detailed, but overall, the document is readable and well-written.

3 - Acceptable: The organization and presentation are sufficient but could be improved. Some sections are unclear or poorly connected, and the text could benefit from better structuring or linguistic revision.

2 - Weak: The structure is unclear or confusing, making it difficult to follow the logical flow. The language is imprecise or lacks fluidity, and the document may contain significant writing, formatting, or organizational errors.

1 - Inadequate: The article is disorganized and difficult to read. It lacks a clear structure, the text is incoherent, and the presentation is poor. Tables and figures, if present, are poorly designed or misplaced, hindering comprehension.

Criterion 5: Confidence Factor (CF) to assess the reliability of the evaluations: Reviewer's Familiarity with the Topic

Score | Description

5 - Expert: The reviewer has an in-depth knowledge of the topic, with direct research experience or publications in the field. They can competently evaluate both the scientific soundness and the contribution of the article.

4 - Well-Informed: The reviewer has a solid understanding of the subject, even if they are not a leading expert. They can assess the work competently but may need to further explore some details.

3 - General Familiarity: The reviewer has a general knowledge of the topic but lacks direct specific experience. The evaluation is possible but may be less thorough on advanced technical or methodological aspects.

2 - Limited Knowledge: The reviewer has only a superficial understanding of the topic and may not be able to accurately assess key aspects of the article.

1 - Not Competent: The reviewer is unfamiliar with the topic and cannot provide an adequate evaluation.