

Guidelines for Reviewers

- **Accept or declining the review request**

1. After receiving an email from the review Organiser, the reviewer can reply to the invitation using the link below the message as shown:

I am a Review Organiser of the "16th European Turbomachinery Conference (ETC16)". I kindly ask you to review the submission referenced below.

Submission ID: 100

Submission Type: Submission to ETC16

Title: Cavitation in inducers

You can find the Reviewer Guidelines at <https://www.euroturbo.eu/reviewer-guidelines/>

We need your review by: 11th Dec 2024, 11:59:59pm CEST

Please reply to my invitation until 14/Oct/2024 (Monday) by clicking on the following link:

<https://www.conftool.net/etc16/il.php?ID=5&q=p6CsqE7R9h&k=6346>

Kind regards,





2. Then the reviewer can choose a reply and then click on **“Submit Message”**, as highlighted in the figure below:

Your Reply to this Review Request	
Your Reviewing Task	You were asked to act as "Regular Reviewer" for the above submission. You will get the user status "Reviewer" for this conference.
* Please Select Your Reply	<input checked="" type="radio"/> I accept the invitation and agree to review this submission <input type="radio"/> I reject the invitation and do not want to review this submission. <input type="radio"/> I need more information to decide.
Add Personal Message to Reply	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Please select if you want to add a personal message to the person who invited you.
Your Personal Message to Mo Elhawary	
Personal Reply	<input type="text"/>
Submit Message	



- **Having access to the paper**

3. After this, the reviewer can log into ConfTool account and then select **“Enter and Edit Reviews”**, as follows:

You can select from the following options:

-  **Show User Account Details**
Here you can access the personal data of your user account.
-  **Edit User Account Details**
Here you can update your personal user data.
-  **Logout**
Please sign out when you are finished to prevent unauthorized access to your account.
-  **Logout and Return to the Main Website**
Sign out and return to the website "16th European Turbomachinery Conference (ETC16)".

You are reviewer or member of the program committee (PC member). You currently have the following options: ?

-  **Show Review Requests Received**
Here you can access all review requests that could have already been assigned to your user account of this event.
You have received 1 requests, 0 are still unanswered.
-  **Enter and Edit Reviews**
Here you can access the contributions that were assigned to you and enter your reviews.
1 contributions were assigned to you. You already entered 0 reviews.

To have access to the paper, you have to click on ‘Contribution Details’ see below.

- ▶ [Show Abstract](#)
- ▶ [Contribution Details](#)
- ▶ [Send E-Mail to Program Committee](#)

You will enter on a page where you will find the details (titles, authors, affiliations...) on the paper. You can also download the draft paper submitted by the authors. (see below)

Contribution Details

Submission Type / Conference Track: Submission to ETC15

Test of submission and review 139

ant daz 

Organization(s): Univ Lille, France

Submitted by: **Prof. ant daz (Univ Lille, FR)**, ID: 1008

Created: 3rd Feb 2022, 02:46:56pm
Last Update: 3rd Feb 2022, 02:46:56pm · Last Upload: 3rd Feb 2022, 02:46:56pm

Topics: 1.7 Multi phase flow
Keywords: bla

13 pages

Abstract

blabla bla
bla bla

Submitted File(s)

st file  Contribution_139.pdf

- **submitting a review (For meta-reviewers and reviewers):**

4. After this, the reviewer “**Enter and Edit Reviews**”, as follows:



Enter and Edit Reviews

Here you can access the contributions that were assigned to you and enter your reviews.
3 contributions were assigned to you. You already entered 0 reviews.

Print View 

Contact and Legal Notice · Contact Address: info@euroturbo.eu
Privacy Statement · Conference: ETC15 - 2023 - demo

Conference Software - ConfTool Pro 2.6.142
© 2001–2022 by Dr. H. Weinreich, Hamburg, Germany

5. In the next page the reviewer can see the details of paper(s) that has been assigned. Then the reviewer can submit a review by clicking on “**Enter Review**” (Enter Meta-review for meta-reviewers), as follows:



6. You have then access to a page where you have to
i/ enter an indicative rating on a the originality, scientific relevance, completeness of the work, quality of presentation and clarity of figures and tables

<p>* Originality and Level of Innovativeness</p>	<p>This rating is indicative and helps the reviewer to give the decisive overall rating below</p> <p><input type="radio"/> 10 - Groundbreaking</p> <p><input type="radio"/> 08 - A pioneer work</p> <p><input type="radio"/> 06 - One step forward</p> <p><input type="radio"/> 04 - Better works on the same topic exist</p> <p><input type="radio"/> 02 - This has been said several times</p> <p><input type="radio"/> 00 - Outdated work</p>
<p>* Scientific Relevance</p>	<p>This rating is indicative and helps the reviewer to give the decisive overall rating below</p> <p><input type="radio"/> 10 - Excellent work and a significant contribution</p> <p><input type="radio"/> 08 - Good work, significant</p> <p><input type="radio"/> 06 - Solid work</p> <p><input type="radio"/> 04 - Weak content</p> <p><input type="radio"/> 02 - Only an insignificant contribution</p> <p><input type="radio"/> 00 - Questionable work</p>
<p>* Completeness of the work</p>	<p>This rating is indicative and helps the reviewer to give the decisive overall rating below</p> <p><input type="radio"/> 10 - Excellent</p> <p><input type="radio"/> 08 - Very good</p> <p><input type="radio"/> 06 - good</p> <p><input type="radio"/> 04 - Average</p> <p><input type="radio"/> 02 - weak</p> <p><input type="radio"/> 00 - Poor</p>
<p>* Quality of Presentation (Organisation, clarity of the text)</p>	<p>This rating is indicative and helps the reviewer to give the decisive overall rating below</p> <p><input type="radio"/> 10 - Excellently written and presented</p> <p><input type="radio"/> 08 - Well written and presented</p> <p><input type="radio"/> 06 - Legible</p> <p><input type="radio"/> 04 - Needs some revision</p> <p><input type="radio"/> 02 - Requires considerable work</p> <p><input type="radio"/> 00 - Not acceptable</p>
<p>* Clarity of figures and tables</p>	<p>This rating is indicative and helps the reviewer to give the decisive overall rating below</p> <p><input type="radio"/> 10 - Excellent</p> <p><input type="radio"/> 08 - Very good</p> <p><input type="radio"/> 06 - good</p> <p><input type="radio"/> 04 - weak</p> <p><input type="radio"/> 02 - very weak</p> <p><input type="radio"/> 00 - unacceptable</p>

ii/ enter the overall rating you give to the paper (mandatory)

* Overall recommendation	<p>Acceptance Rating The decision about the paper (acceptance, journal publication, ...) is taken mainly on the basis of this rating.</p> <p><input type="radio"/> R > 90 - Outstanding. Accepted for Journal publication. Potential candidate for the Best Paper Award and additional promotion by the journal</p> <p><input type="radio"/> 80 < R < 90 - Excellent. Accepted for Journal publication. Potential candidate for the Best Paper Award</p> <p><input type="radio"/> 70 < R < 80 - Very good. Accepted for journal publication after minor revision</p> <p><input type="radio"/> 60 < R < 70 - Good. Potentially eligible for journal publication after a second review</p> <p><input type="radio"/> 50 < R < 60 - Above Average. Potentially eligible for journal publication after a second review</p> <p><input type="radio"/> 40 < R < 50 - Average Paper. Accepted for the conference.</p> <p><input type="radio"/> 30 < R < 40 - Below average. Can be accepted to the conference</p> <p><input type="radio"/> 20 < R < 30 - Weak. May be rejected if too many papers</p> <p><input type="radio"/> 10 < R < 20 - Very weak. Can be rejected if too many papers</p> <p><input type="radio"/> 00 < R < 10 - Poor paper. Should be rejected.</p> <p><input type="radio"/> 0 - Rejected (Out of scope, plagiarism)</p>
---------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

iii/ write your comments to the authors. Mandatory (you can also write them in an additional pdf file, but writing something on this box is mandatory. If you want to upload a pdf, this will be possible later in the process)

* Comments for the Authors	<p>Please explain your evaluation in a detailed and clear manner. Point out strengths and weaknesses of the submitted contribution. Please also provide suggestions for improvement and use an objective and constructive writing style.</p> <div style="border: 1px solid #ccc; height: 150px; width: 100%;"></div>
-----------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

iii/ indicate if the paper can be candidate for the Best paper award.




iv/ write comments to the conference chairs. The comments will not be seen by the authors.

- The next page will show the review-form that includes the overall evaluation and the comments for the authors. After filling the form, the reviewer can submit the review by clicking on “**Submit and Finalize Review**”, as follows:

Please note: Finalized reviews cannot be edited anymore. Please finalize all reviews before the review deadline.

[Submit and Finalize Review](#)

[Save as Draft](#)

Overview > Enter and Edit Reviews > **Submit Review** Print View   


Contact and Legal Notice · Contact Address: info@euroturbo.eu
Privacy Statement · Conference: ETC15 - 2023 - demo

Conference Software - **ConfTool Pro** 2.6.142
© 2001–2022 by Dr. H. Weinreich, Hamburg, Germany

8. The reviewer can also upload a comment file to authors after the last step by clicking on **“Submit and Finalize Review”** and then by choosing **“Upload File for Author”**, as follows:

Actions

- ▶ [Edit Review](#)
- ▶ [Upload File for Author](#)
- ▶ [Overview of all reviews assigned to you](#)

Overview > Enter and Edit Reviews > **Submit Review** Print View   

Contact and Legal Notice · Contact Address: info@euroturbo.eu
Privacy Statement · Conference: ETC15 - 2023 - demo

Conference Software - **ConfTool Pro** 2.6.142
© 2001–2022 by Dr. H. Weinreich, Hamburg, Germany