

REVIEWER FORM

- The paper **MUST** be reviewed with the same degree of thoroughness as any other paper published in IEEE journals in terms of technical merit, and in terms of IEEE format.
 - Since the majority of the papers will be created using a computer, the reviewer should not hesitate to require the author to make changes so that the paper is raised to IEEE technical merit standards.
 - Please complete the Reviewer's Report Form given below and on the reverse side of this page. You may also make comments directly on the review copy of the paper. **Please use a BLACK pen as RED ink may not fax properly.**
 - This form and the paper with your revisions (if needed) must be returned to the appropriate Technical Editor **NO LATER THAN OCTOBER 21, 2005.**
 - Please reference the enclosed listing or the conference web site (mt-19.ge.infn.it) to obtain the Technical Editors' contact information and the sessions assigned to them to ensure that you submit your Reviewer's Report Form and comments to the appropriate editor. **PLEASE FAX OR EMAIL THE COMPLETED REVIEWER FORM AND ANY ADDITIONAL COMMENTS TO THE TECHNICAL EDITOR. DO NOT SEND VIA MAIL.**
-

MT-19 REVIEWER'S REPORT

Paper Number: TUA08PO01 Paper Title: Research of Reproducibility of Dipoles for CSRm

First Author: Y. L. Su

IEEE Format of the Paper:

1. Is the paper formatted according to the IEEE formatting standards that were included in the Instructions to Authors for the preparation of their manuscript? Yes X No If no, please circle the items that need to be corrected.

- Number of Pages (4 oral/poster, 6 invited).
- Paper Size (8.5" x 11").
- Columns - fully justified.
- Column width - 88 mm (3.45 in.).
- Spacing between columns - 5 mm (0.2 in.).
- Paragraph indentation - 3.5 mm (0.14 in.).
- Paper spacing needs to be adjusted between text and section headings, tables, etc. to obtain equal lengths for adjacent columns.
- Paper spacing adjusted on last page to obtain equal column lengths.
- Hyphenation.
- Correct font (Times New Roman or similar).
- Use of appropriate capitalization for the words within the title.
- Use of appropriate abbreviations and acronyms.
- Use of correct format for tables and figures.
- Use of correct format for appendixes and acknowledgments.
- Use of correct format for references.
- Spelling corrections necessary.

Technical Merit of the Paper:

1. Is the paper's subject matter about Applied Superconductivity? Yes No X If no, please explain further in the Reviewer Comments section on the reverse side of this form. The paper's subject is about magnet technology.
2. Is the author's meaning clear and is the paper arranged logically? Yes No X If no, please use BLACK ink on the review copy of the paper to indicate the sections that require revisions.
3. Does the paper contain errors in fact? Yes X No If yes, please use BLACK ink on the review copy of the paper to indicate the errors. Additional remarks should be recorded in the Reviewer Comments section on the reverse side of this form.
4. The paper technical merit is: Outstanding Above Average Average Below Average
Contains No Technical Merit X

.....
DO NOT WRITE REVIEWER COMMENTS BELOW THE LINE
.....

5. The paper originality: New theory, data or technique _____ Similar to work done by others X _____
 A review of previous work by the same author(s) _____
6. As far as you know, has this paper been published before? Yes _____ No X _____
 If yes, where was it previously published. _____
7. Does the title properly describe the paper? Yes _____ No X _____
 Does the abstract describe the contents of the paper? Yes _____ No X _____
 Does the summary express the main points of the paper? Yes _____ No _____ **summary ?**
8. Are all of the tables and figures necessary for a good technical understanding of the paper? Yes X _____ No _____
 Are the tables and figures clear? Yes X _____ No _____
 Are the figure and table captions clear? Yes X _____ No _____
9. Does the author place the paper in proper context by the use of appropriate references? Yes X, but only auto references
 No _____
 If no, please explain. Additional remarks should be recorded in the Reviewer Comments section of this form.
10. Is the paper written in correct English? Yes nearly _____ No _____ Please use BLACK ink to indicate any English errors on the review copy of the paper.

Recommendation:

_____ Publish as is.

_____ Publish, revisions required. (See edits on paper and reviewer comments.)

X _____ Reject. **INDICATE REASON FOR REJECTION.**

_____ Not Applied Superconductivity. Suggestion for an alternate journal. _____

X _____ Lack of Technical Merit.

_____ Not Original Work.

_____ Work Published Previously.

_____ Unsatisfactory English.

Reviewer Comments:

The use of the term *reproducibility* is misleading in the text and not appropriate.

The expression (10) defining the reproducibility ξ cannot be deduced from (6) and (9) and the rest of the paper is thus questionable. ϵ just after the expression (10) is used instead of ξ because of a typing error?

All the paper content could be condensed in 2 pages and this puts in question its relevance.

DO NOT WRITE REVIEWER COMMENTS BELOW THE LINE
 PLEASE REMOVE THE REVIEWERS DETAILS BEFORE SENDING TO AUTHOR

Reviewer's Signature Pugnat _____

Name (Please Print) PUGNAT Pierre _____

Telephone Number: +41 (22) 767 9533 _____ FAX Number: +41 (22) 767 6230 _____

E-mail: Pierre.Pugnat@cern.ch _____