

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 FRM2OR1 Paper Title Trends in field quality along the production of the LHC dipoles and differences among manufacturers

First Author Ezio Todesco

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 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 Magnet Technology? Yes No If no, please explain further in the Reviewer Comments section on the reverse side of this form.
2. Is the author's meaning clear and is the paper arranged logically? Yes No 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 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

DO NOT WRITE REVIEWER COMMENTS BELOW THE LINE

5. The paper originality: New theory, data or technique Similar to work done by others _____
 A review of previous work by the same author(s) _____
6. As far as you know, has this paper been published before? Yes _____ No
 If yes, where was it previously published. _____
7. Does the title properly describe the paper? Yes No _____
 Does the abstract describe the contents of the paper? Yes No _____
 Does the summary express the main points of the paper? Yes No _____
8. Are all of the tables and figures necessary for a good technical understanding of the paper? Yes No _____
 Are the tables and figures clear? Yes No _____
 Are the figure and table captions clear? Yes No _____
9. Does the author place the paper in proper context by the use of appropriate references? Yes 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 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.)
 _____ Reject. **INDICATE REASON FOR REJECTION.**
 _____ Not Magnet Technology. Suggestion for an alternate journal. _____
 _____ Lack of Technical Merit.
 _____ Not Original Work.
 _____ Work Published Previously.
 _____ Unsatisfactory English.

Reviewer Comments:

A minor typo in page 1, section II. Remove the comma after 1.9 K.

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