

Dear Reviewer,

Thank you for helping to make NURETH-20 a success. Your assistance has been requested in reviewing for NURETH-20 because of your expertise in thermal hydraulics. As you review the paper(s) assigned to you, please follow the guidelines below.

We are asking that all reviews be submitted as early as possible, but no later than February 28. If you will not be able to complete the review by this time, please let your Session Chair know as soon as possible so that the paper may be assigned to another reviewer. Thank you in advance for your assistance and support of NURETH-20.

NURETH-20 Review Guidelines

When reviewing the submitted paper, please consider the following list of questions as part of your review.

1. ORIGINALITY: Is this an original contribution? Is new and important information presented? Does the work advance the state of the science and/or the art of thermal hydraulics?
2. CORRECTNESS AND COMPLETENESS: Are the title and, particularly, the abstract consistent with the text? Is the manuscript correct and complete? Does it give adequate credit to earlier work in the field? Formatting and content should follow [the template](#) .
3. PRESENTATION: Is the subject presented clearly and logically? Are the conclusions clear and consistent with the work done?
4. OVERALL evaluation: What is your overall impression? What is your recommendation? Four recommendations are possible:
 - a. Publication as is (Accept)
 - b. Publication after minor revision following comments provided (Accept with Revisions)
 - c. Possible publication after review of major revision following comments provided (Reject Unless Revised)
 - d. Rejection (Reject)

Please also provide scores between 1 and 10 for each category (Originality, Completeness and Correctness, Presentation, Overall). The scores will be used to determine the best paper awards winners. When providing your score please USE THE FULL RANGE 1-10 to ensure that scores are consistent between reviewers.

This is how the scores will be interpreted by the technical program committee:

Originality

10: Work described a totally unique or novel method of problem approach and solution.

8: Work built on existing approaches or solutions, but provided new techniques or methods.

6: Work reviewed existing activities in the area, but provided alternatives or new viewpoints.

4: Work was a review of common and accepted methods.

2: Work had no practical benefit or no benefit could be seen from the presentation.

0: Work was either a copy of previously presented material or a pure marketing presentation.

Correctness and Completeness

10: Work had no obvious errors or omissions and provided sufficient detail to determine if the work was complete and correct. Work adequately integrated with other work in the field.

8: Work appeared to be substantially correct and complete, but had minor errors of omission or commission. Work adequately integrated with other work in the field.

6: Work omitted one or more major principles for solution of the problem, and/or lacked sufficient detail. Work defined methods that may be controversial and/or unproven but could be of potential interest if proven correct.

4: Work was vague on specific implementation methods for the solution. Work minimally acceptable in term of coordination with other activities and processes. References are severely lacking.

2: Work was vague to the point where the solution may only be in the concept stage without sufficient thought of completion. Work was not well integrated with other work in the field and added little new information.

0: Work was without sufficient information or thought for application and/or contained material errors or omissions. Work contained significant unsubstantiated differences with other generally accepted work in the field.

Presentation

10: Superior presentation with a logical flow path from problem statement to solution. Conclusions followed naturally from presented material.

8: Good presentation, with minor gaps in logical flow and/or argument. Conclusions could be reached from presented material, but some concepts taken on faith.

6: Weakness in logic and/or argument detracted from overall adequacy of presentation. Some conclusions not adequately supported by presented material.

4: Flaws in logical flow, but problem understood and solution supported. Some conclusions required significant additional information not provided in the presentation

2: Presentation provided solutions without defining the problem or need for solutions. Important conclusions not fully justified based on the presentation.

0: Premise of the presentation cannot be followed. Conclusions not justified based on the presentation

Overall

10: Best paper award

8: Archival value

6: Acceptable

5: Major revision, serious flaws

Below 5: Do not accept

Comments

If revision or rejection is indicated, please give detailed, specific, and substantive comments.

We would appreciate information on any errors that you may note or minor changes in wording you may wish to suggest. We would appreciate it if you would indicate such errors or suggested changes on the manuscript and upload it along with your review. If you do provide comments or changes on the manuscript, be sure to make your comments and the document anonymous.

All American Nuclear Society publications require the use of SI units; if the author(s) used non-SI or mixed units, please state this in your review.

Nominations for Archival Papers

A full-length paper submitted to NURETH-20 may be nominated for archival paper publication as part of the special issues. (Journals may require another round of technical review). This can be done by clicking the "Best Paper (highly recommend for journal publication)" box in the top-right corner.

The nominator should evaluate whether the first several questions for full paper review can be answered with a positive response. Tentatively we recommend reviewers to recommend papers that score above 8 in all categories.

All papers nominated for archival publication will be considered for a best paper award.

==

NOTE: For any question about the EPSR system please contact Janet Davis jdavis@ans.org.