

Guidelines for Light Refereeing of IPAC17 Papers

These are guidelines for refereeing of IPAC papers for publication in the Institute of Physics (IOP) Conference proceedings series. Three types of criteria have to be considered in order to qualify a paper for publication in this category. A failure to fulfil the criteria under 1) should normally result in the rejection of the paper, deficits under 2) and 3) can be corrected by the authors within a single iteration.

1) Validity and Originality

If the paper contains significant errors and miss-conceptions that result in wrong conclusions and these errors cannot be corrected, the paper must be rejected. If there are strong indications that the presented work was not worked out by the authors and is not original (in the sense that work has originated from the authors), the paper must be rejected.

2) Presentation and Style

The paper must be written in good English. The results must be understandable and be presented in a clear way, in line with scientific standards. Important assumptions and inputs are specified. Previous work should be referenced comprehensively (in the Jacow standard up to one full page is available for references). Graphics, figures, data must be reproduced in good quality with readable text and numbers. Axis units must be indicated where necessary.

3) Content

The relevance of the scientific and engineering content of the paper must be assessed. For the planned type of refereed conference proceedings we request a lower scientific standard as for papers published in a high level journal, such as Physical Review. The work on particle accelerators requires often performance enhancements, technical improvements or engineering work which are very valuable for the field. Our aim is to promote also such publications in this referenced category of IPAC proceedings. Examples of qualifying content are given below:

- self-performed theoretical analysis or numerical simulation study
- experimental studies on accelerators, presentation of methodology and results
- new operational methods, new optimization methods, performance enhancements of facilities, development of new hardware, evolutionary improvements of a facility involving small steps in performance parameters
- engineering work towards new or improved accelerator devices or instrumentation
- systematic and scientific description and analysis of problems and observations in accelerator facilities, even if the observations are not understood by a theory
- proposal of new concepts or new accelerator based facilities
- review type of paper with a value in combining the results of different studies on a topic in one publication; the review of results, challenges or achievements must be self-performed

The assessment of these criteria is done within an electronic form in order to standardize and streamline the review process.