JOURNAL OF COMPUTER SECURITY

Manuscript Review Form

Date Sent: Please return form to:
Date to be returned:
Version:
Author(s):
Title:
Name of Referee:

In accordance with the Instructions to Referees (see Page 2), please complete the following review form. Sections I and II are for the editor only; Section III will be returned to the author(s).

I. SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATION

SUMMARY OF EVALUATION (please circle appropriate answer):

Strong Accept	Acceptable	Marginally Acceptable	Marginally Unacceptable	Unacceptable

RECOMMENDATION (please check appropriate answer):

[ ] Accept with no changes.
[ ] Accept if certain minor revisions are made (see Section III).
[ ] Author should prepare a major revision (see Section III) for a second review. (Not applicable if the paper is already a major revision of a previously reviewed paper.)
[ ] Reject.

If the paper is rejected for publication in the JCS, the author should:
[ ] Prepare a major revision and resubmit to the JCS as a "new" paper.
[ ] Submit to another journal:
[ ] Regard the paper as not publishable.

INSTRUCTIONS TO REFEREES

Reviewers should see themselves as protectors of the quality of the JCS, as well as of the reputation of the authors who submit papers. It is the reviewer's responsibility to make sure only high quality papers are published, and that the authors are protected from putting poor work into print. From this perspective, the reviewer should not only read the papers thoroughly to find flaws but should also make recommendations to the authors as to how the paper might be improved. For a contribution to be acceptable for publication, it must comprise novel material not previously published in an archival journal. The novelty will usually lie in original results, methods, syntheses, or new insights into previously reported research. If major revisions are recommended, the referee should point these out as specifically as possible, and should differentiate changes regarded as optional from those judged as mandatory. If the revisions are extensive, it is perhaps best to reject the paper and recommend preparation of a "new," radically revised manuscript for resubmission to the JCS. If a paper is rejected mainly on the basis of reader interest, the reviewer may wish to recommend submission to a more appropriate journal. Papers with little or no salvageable material should be rejected outright and discouraged from later submission.

II. COMMENTS TO BE WITHELD FROM AUTHOR(S)

DATE: SIGNATURE OF REFEREE

III. DETAILED COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Reviewer: Please typewrite or print your comments and suggestions regarding the paper. Particular attention should be given to details that guide possible revisions or explain reasons for rejection. Feel free to continue on extra sheets if necessary.