

## Manuscript Review Form: Reviewer A

*Date sent:*

*Journal:*

*Manuscript #:*

*Editor:*

*Title of Paper:*

*Author(s):*

*Manuscript Type:*

*Manuscript Status:*

---

### RECOMMENDATION (Please select one)

**Approved:**

- Accept in present form (final manuscript)  
 Approved, consider suggested revisions

**Decline:**

- Final  
 Final, transfer to...  
ASCE Journal: \_\_\_\_\_  
Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**\*Re-review required, resubmit as:**

- Technical Paper  
 Technical Note  
 Case Study  
 Forum

*\*Final decision deferred; depends on revisions.*

---

### CRITIQUE: (Please type or print additional comments on a separate page.)

---

### EVALUATION (circle one)

Poor  
1

Below Average  
2

Average  
3

Above Average  
4

Exceptional  
5

Possible Award Quality

Award Quality

---

**\*\*Note to Reviewer:** Please sign reverse side to permit direct copying while retaining anonymity.\*\*

### **ASSESSMENT OF "AWARD CALIBER"**

- 5 Exceptionally good paper; definitely worthy of serious consideration for an award
- 4 Better-than-average paper; may well be worthy of an award
- 3 Average paper; possibly, but not likely, of award caliber
- 2 Below-average paper; not worthy of consideration for an award

### **REVIEW INSTRUCTIONS**

If you cannot review this paper, please return it immediately. If you cannot review the paper within two weeks, but can do so at a later date, please advise the person who sent it to you immediately.

You are encouraged to use an additional sheet for comments. We strongly discourage reviewers from making comments directly on the manuscript because we e-mail only the decision letter and reviews to authors when their manuscripts are accepted.

Reviewers are anonymous to authors (your name and signature will be omitted from the copy of the review form sent to authors).

Use a professional approach in your comments—they should be aimed at assisting the author(s).

Be as specific as possible in your comments.

Specific questions to consider in your evaluation include:

- Does the manuscript present a specific, easily identifiable advance in knowledge? Is it applicable and useful to the profession?
- Has the information already been published elsewhere, either wholly or in part?
- Is the subject matter within the scope of the journal? Or is it better suited for another journal?
- Do the title and abstract accurately describe the contents? Does the abstract include all of the main findings of the study?
- Is the review of literature limited to that framing the new knowledge? Are all references pertinent and complete?
- Is the methodology sufficiently well explained that someone else knowledgeable about the field could repeat the study?
- Is each figure and table necessary to the understanding of the conclusions? Can any be omitted without comprising the paper's message?
- Are the results soundly interpreted and related to existing knowledge on the topic?
- Are the conclusions justified? Do they follow logically from data presented?
- Do all elements of the manuscript relate logically to the study's statement of purpose?
- Can the paper be shortened without comprising its message?

### **REVIEWER A'S SIGNATURE**

Names are confidential and will be removed before review comments are forwarded to authors.

NAME (TYPED OR PRINTED BY HAND)

PHONE:

ADDRESS:

FAX:

E-MAIL:

DATE: