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<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technical Quality</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relevance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Originality</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequacy of Citations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
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<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
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____ ACCEPT as a REGULAR (AR) or SHORT (AS) paper provided that all typographic errors and minor recommendations are corrected in the final draft. (Any such changes are marked on the copy of the paper enclosed. One of the editors should be able to verify that these changes have been made.)

____ Should this paper be considered for the Best Paper Award?

____ CONDITIONALLY ACCEPT as a REGULAR (CR) or SHORT (CS) paper, provided that minor revisions are made as indicated in the "Comments to Authors" on the next page. (The editors may decide to request reviewers' assistance in verifying the changes. If you believe reviewer verification to be especially important, please indicate in the "Confidential Comments" below.)

____ REVISE AND RESUBMIT as REGULAR (RR) or SHORT (RS) paper as indicated in the "Comments to Authors" on the next page.

____ REJECT THE PAPER (R) (Future submissions of this work to the Transactions will be treated as substantially new papers. Depending on circumstances, the editors may choose to include previous reviews of the rejected paper in any subsequent review of revised versions.)

____ Submit to another journal ______________
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1. Please respect the deadline indicated on the review form. As an author, you undoubtedly appreciate the importance of minimizing delays. The paper selection procedure for the Transactions involves a tentative publication recommendation (TPR) which is prepared by the Associate Editor on the basis of paper reviews. The final decision on publication, sustaining or modifying the TPR, is taken by the Editorial Board of the Transactions. If you do not have the time to personally review the paper, please see if one of your qualified associates or students can review the paper, or else return the paper via first class or air mail immediately. In the latter case, suggestions of names or alternate reviewers are appreciated.

2. Please prepare your comments to the author using the enclosed form and additional plain sheets if necessary. Please do not identify yourself or your organization. The following points are suggested for your comments: (A) What is the contribution of the paper? (B) Does the author explain the significance of the paper? (C) Is the paper clearly written and well organized? (D) Does the introduction state the purpose of the paper? (E) Are the references relevant and complete? Supply missing references. (F) If the paper is not technically sound, why not? (G) If the paper is too long, how can it be shortened? Please supply any information that you think will be useful to the author in revision, in enhancing the appeal of the paper, or in convincing him of his mistakes. The reviewer's recommendation for acceptance or rejection should appear only on Page 1 of the review form and should not be included in the comments to the author. It is very important that the reviewer include at least a few sentences justifying their recommendation.

3. In your critical comments to the author, please be specific. If you find that the results are already known, please give references to earlier papers which contain these or similar results. If you say that the reasoning is incorrect or vague, please indicate specifically where and why. If you suggest that the paper be rewritten, give specific suggestions as to which parts of the paper should be deleted, amplified or modified, and please indicate how.

4. It is sometimes the case that papers are passed on to graduate students for review. Some very excellent reviews sometimes result from this. It is important, though, that the quality and professionalism of the review be maintained. If you pass the paper on to a student to review, please check the review personally and countersign the review form where indicated.