ICPEU 2019 Evaluation Form
Double-Blind Reviewing

*Thank you for agreeing to be one of our reviewers. We are keen to ensure a high standard of papers for our conferences and the paper that is being sent to you has been submitted after a first selection process. We are eager to help authors who may not yet have achieved a suitable skill in writing academic papers to the necessary quality. To this end we would be grateful if you would, wherever possible, provide constructive advice as to how they can make the paper more acceptable for presentation at a quality academic conference. The conference committee would therefore be grateful if you would complete the table and rate the paper on the issues described below. As with all double-blind reviewing any comments you make will be passed to the authors on an anonymous basis.

*These guidelines are intended to assist the reviewer in assigning point values for the scoring categories. The reviewer is free to assign values between those suggested and to apply additional criteria.

Author's Submission Choice □ Publication √ Oral/Presenter □ Poster □ Either

Date: November 4th 2019

A. SCIENTIFIC CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION

SCIENTIFIC CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION **Paper ID: EIIS D002** **TITLE OF PAPER:** **Lighting System to Achieve Visual Comfort at the Budi Luhur University Library in Jakarta**	Please provide a rating as indicated for each of the criteria listed below. Rating categories are as follows: **/ = Unsure** **0 = Not applicable** **1 = unacceptable** **2 = acceptable** **3 = outstanding**
ORIGINALITY	
1. Are the problems discussed in the article new?	2
2. Does the article describe an innovative combination of techniques from different disciplines?	2
3. Does the article introduce an idea that appears promising or might stimulate others to develop promising alternatives?	2
SIGNIFICANCE	
1. Does the article have a considerable contribution to a certain area of research?	2
2. Does the article stimulate discussion of important issues or alternative points of view?	2
RELEVANCE	
1. Does the article fit in ICPEU's area of research?	2
2. Does the article present relevant information for its area of research?	2
PRESENTATION	
1. Does the article have a logic structure?	2
2. Is the manuscript competently written?	2
3. Is the article correctly written (from the grammar point of view)?	2
4. Is the manuscript well integrated, including an appropriate methodology?	2
CONTENT	
1. Title	
□ Does the title clearly and concisely express the content of the article?	2
2. Abstract	

☐	Is the abstract well organized, coherent, and clearly written?	2
☐	Is the background, purpose, methods, and results clearly summarized?	2
3.	**Introduction**	
☐	Does the introduction correctly highlight the current concerns in the area?	2
☐	Does the introduction specify the research objectives?	2
4.	**Methodology**	
☐	Are the methods used clearly explained?	1
☐	Are the methods, data, statistics used validated/reliable /recognized?	1
5.	**Results**	
☐	Are the results clearly presented?	2
☐	Are all relevant connections with others' work/research declared?	2
☐	Is the literature used in support of research sufficiently comprehensive and current?	2
☐	Do the results sufficiently avoid misinterpretation?	2
☐	Do the results sufficiently avoid assumptions and speculations?	2
6.	**Conclusions**	
☐	Are the conclusions correctly / logically explained?	1
☐	Do the conclusions sufficiently avoid misinterpretation?	2
☐	Do the conclusions sufficiently avoid too general or biased information?	2
☐	Future plans /advice to others?	1
7.	**References**	
☐	Do the references reflect the latest work/research in the considered area?	1
☐	Are the references correctly indicated in the article?	1
8.	**Tables**	
☐	Do the tables correctly indicate the measuring units and the source?	2
☐	Are the tables correctly named and numbered?	2
☐	Are the data presented in tables correctly valued and interpreted in the article?	2
☐	Are the tables well-proportioned and aesthetically placed in the article?	2
9.	**Graphs and figures**	
☐	Do the graphs and figures properly illustrate the discussed subject?	2
☐	Do the graphs and figures correctly indicate the measuring units and the source?	2
☐	Are the graphs and figures correctly named and numbered?	2
☐	Are the data presented in graphs and figures correctly valued and interpreted in the article?	2
☐	Are the graphs and figures well-proportioned and aesthetically placed in the article?	2

Do you recommend that the paper be accepted or rejected?	**ACCEPT**
	~~**REJECT**~~

B. Comments

*Authors are very interested in the reviewers' written comments. This feedback is highly valued by them, therefore, the Scientific Committee kindly asks all reviewers to provide comments and suggestions for the authors.

REVIEWERS COMMENTS:

ACCEPT WITH MINOR REVISION
Please write your paper according to the template of icpeu 2019

C. REVIEWER'S RECOMMENDATION   □ Publish   √ Oral   □ Poster   □ Either

[   ] 6- Superior. could be invited to submit an extended version to appear in other Transaction or journal. (This rating should be used only in rare cases, Please indicate if you think this paper is worthy of consideration.)

[   ] 5- Perfectly acceptable. informative and comprehensive

[   ] 4- Rather acceptable. provides the majority of key information

[   ] 3- Satisfactory. provides some information but not overly informative

[√] 2- Marginal. __√___accept after minor revisions; do not send me the revision for a second review

[   ] 1 Marginal. _____requires major revision; send me the revised version for a second evaluation

[   ] 0 Unacceptable. information is incomplete or absent

ICPEU 2019 Committee