

JOCN Review Criteria

Please base your review on these criteria: science/engineering content, presentation, and appropriateness. These criteria are listed below.

Science/Engineering Content

Paper reports original science or engineering on optical network issues such as design, operations, performance or technology. Results are significant to the field. Conclusions are supported by the data and/or the analysis presented. Work is placed in proper context. Related work is adequately referenced. Warrants publication in an archival journal.

(Select one)

Level 1: The paper meets the criteria above.

Level 2: Significant clarification/revision is needed to meet the criteria above. (Specify revisions that might allow this manuscript to be acceptable below.)

Level 3: The results may be correct but do not represent a significant advance, will have little impact on the work of others, or offer only incremental improvement to existing work.

Level 4: The paper is unpublishable due to major scientific errors, the same material has been published or is being considered for publication elsewhere, or the technique is not useful.

Appropriateness of Topic

(Select one)

Level 1: Highly appropriate for JOCN

Level 2: Marginally appropriate

Level 3: Outside the scope of JOCN

Suggestion of more appropriate journal:

The paper presents results that would be of interest to the general media: Yes No

Separate comments for the Editor and for the Author may be provided in the online form. Please contact JOCN staff at jocn@osa.org if you have any questions or experience difficulties completing the review.

Presentation

Title clearly identifies the subject matter. Abstract is succinct and comprehensible to a non-specialist. Manuscript is clearly written and logically organized. Figures and tables are understandable and readable when sized for publication. Length is appropriate to topic. Quality of writing is adequate (English usage, grammar). Multimedia content, if present, contributes to the description of the research.

(Select one)

Level 1: The paper meets the criteria above

Level 2: Revisions needed to meet criteria above. (Describe required revisions below.)

Level 3: Extensive revision required to meet presentation criteria. Organization or writing style of the manuscript makes it too difficult to review. English usage, grammar or spelling errors require substantial copy-editing before the paper can be published or reviewed adequately.

Recommendation to Editor

(Select one)

Accept as submitted.

Accept after authors make revisions noted in the report below. Rereview is not necessary.

Accept subject to successful major revision as indicated in the report. Additional review is necessary.

Reject. Does not meet criteria as indicated in the report below.

Other. See report below.