



The sCO₂ Conference Review Process

Dear Reviews

The organization team appreciates your willingness to spend your time on reviewing one or multiple papers. This one pager provides you with the major input for your work.

The approved paper will be published open access in the conference proceedings.

Review Criteria in Brief

The European sCO₂ Conference relies on the peer review process. The purpose of review is to determine whether the paper is acceptable for publication, needs revision, or should be rejected.

Foremost and above all else:

- Is the paper relevant and interesting to the sCO₂ community?
- What is the purpose of the paper?
- Is the presentation satisfactory and well organised?
- Is the paper of an appropriate length (clear/concise)?
- Is there an appropriate introduction?
- Is there validation of any theory or computational method?
- Is the experimental accuracy assessed?
- Is the method of approach valid?
- Is it technically correct?
- Are the figures and tables appropriate?
- Is there sufficient analysis and interpretation of each figure?
- Are the conclusions drawn from the results? Are there any conclusions or is there just a summary?
- Are the references appropriate?
- Is the use of English satisfactory?

In terms of originality, significance and relevance:

- Is the contribution original or innovative?
- Does the work advance the "state of the art" sufficiently?
- What are the main conclusions/recommendations?
- Are the conclusions and recommendations tangible and useful to the sCO₂ community?
- Has more than a small amount, say 25%, of the paper been published before in a similar format?

- Is the subject of the paper appropriate for the conference?
- Is it of long-term, archival value?

A good review must provide

- A summary of the paper's most important points (one to five sentences) to indicate that the reviewer actually understands the paper.
- A statement of the significance, relevance and originality of the research, or lack thereof.
- A critical evaluation of the methodology, accuracy and suitability of the work.
- An evaluation of the quality of the presentation.
- An overall recommendation for or against conference presentation and/or publication.
- Clear statements of both necessary and suggested changes required before conference presentation and/or publication.

A review does not need to contain a blow-by-blow account of every single typographical error unless these and/or other problems are so numerous that they render the paper unpresentable or unpublishable.

What Constitutes a good Paper?

A good paper

- is interesting.
- is original, making a unique, imaginative or innovative contribution to the field.
- contains a clear narrative, from the introduction, through the work carried out to a clear expression of substantial conclusions and recommendations.
- is of sufficient significance and relevance to the sCO₂ industry, and it has the potential to be referred to by other workers in the field in the coming years.