GUIDE FOR REVIEWERS

Welcome to the guide for reviewers of the NEIS conference. This document serves as a comprehensive resource to outline the standards, processes, and best methodologies for reviewing the submitted papers to the conference. With the increasing scientific reputation as well as the academic impact factor of the NEIS conferences, a good practice is found to adhere to rigorous and up-to-date reviewing standards. This guide not only elucidates the specific criteria and expectations for evaluating the submissions, but also provides a summarized overview about the NEIS conferences mission, main focus, and subtopics for the current 2024 version. Moreover, with the presented reviewing outlines, and after following the concrete dos and avoiding the don'ts highlighted herein, reviewers will well contribute in shaping the caliber of the papers, and consequently, the overall success of the conference. It is worth to say finally, that by joining us as reviewers with upholding higher standards for reviewing, not only the NEIS conference will continue to be a hallmark of innovations and scholarly excellence, but also enable reviewers to acquire a comprehensive understanding of contemporary active reviewing strategies for a more effective and informed reviewing experience.

NEIS-CONFERENCES MISSION

NEIS represents an annual conference that is hosted by the chair of electrical power systems department, at the Helmut Schmidt University in Hamburg, Germany. Since 2013, NEIS conferences have provided a forum for academics ranging from undergraduate students to professors, to share, present, and discuss modern developments in the fields of energy supply and energy storage technologies. During the span of continuous eleven years, NEIS has improved to adapt newer electrical engineering topics, where in this year it will focus mainly on the methods and practical approaches for power systems planning and management. The promotion of renewable energies, fuel cells, e-mobility, and H_2 plants has definitely started a paradigm shift in modern electrical grids, posing hence new challenges. In the light of the optimized power system operation and management, artificial intelligence in electrical grids, operation of future AC and DC grids, intelligent monitoring of power systems, grid integration, contemporary energy storage systems, fuel cells, and multi-grids control, the NEIS event is launched to establish a platform for academics to present their relevant newest findings in such domains.

REVIEWING OUTLINES

In the field of scientific publishing, exists a vast array of available reviewing methods, imposing thus a daunting challenge for the reviewers when choosing the most effective technique. Recognizing this inherent complexity in such a decision-making process, it is crucial for the

reviewers to acknowledge that the evaluation criteria for this NEIS conference, diverge from those applied in a journal paper. To streamline and clarify the reviewing process for our specific NEIS conference, we have distilled a comprehensive set of guidelines into four major categories (labelled from A to D), meticulously approved by our editorial board. Within each sub-set of the four main sections, reviewers are encouraged to utilize a detailed check-list, ensuring solicitous scrutiny and adherence to every specified criterion. This systematic approach aims to provide clarity and structure, facilitating an efficient and thorough review process tailored to the unique requirements of our conference.

A. ETHICS

Ethics and research integrity form the main backbone of scientific research, emphasizing the fundamental principles of honesty, transparency, fairness, equity, and objectivity. Accordingly, reviewers for the NEIS conference, are considered as upholders and gatekeeps for authentic scholarly publications. In order to ensure that the submitted papers to the NEIS conference meet the highest academic standards, reviewers are kindly asked to ensure the following criterion, in this set:

1. Conflict of interest: reviewers are kindly asked to declare having no conflict of interest with any of the authors

2. Relevance check: the manuscript's theme must coincide with the reviewer's expertise

3. Review adequacy: reviewers are expected to give themselves sufficient time to read, analyze, investigate, and properly assess their assigned manuscript(s)

4. Data confidentiality: all data must be treated with high confidentiality (ideas, materials, etc. must be kept private, not shared, etc.)

B. ACADEMIC SIGNIFICANCE AND VALIDATION

The academic significance of the NEIS submitted manuscripts must be discerned. Generally, a manuscript's academic significance encapsulates the contribution that it makes with respect to its field of study, emphasizing thus the novel insights, advancements, and applications which it introduces. The validation criteria play a critical role in this assessment, guiding reviewers to evaluate the rigor and reliability of the manuscript. As stewards of scholarly integrity, reviewers are kindly asked to navigate the nuances of originality, methodological strength, and potential weaknesses to ensure that only impactful and rigorously validated contributions find their way into the NEIS conference:

1. Originality: the manuscript must show a high degree of originality. The NEIS conference upholds a strict policy against the dissemination of work that duplicates or extends previously published ideas, emphasizing the importance of showcasing fresh and innovative research

2. Significance assessment: the results presented in the manuscript must coherently address the raised problem statement

3. Strength/weakness assessment: manuscripts are to be assessed for their points of strength/weakness, as a manner to objectively investigate the robustness and limitations of the presented research, ensuring thus a well-enhanced critique

4. Addressing methodology: the presented results must be shown to have been conclusively deduced from the employed methodology, which itself must be described in detail

5. Evaluating consistency: Each manuscript's finding shall pose no contradictions with any law, norm, or mathematical model

C. TECHNICAL PRECISION

Aiming for the clarity and coherence of the NEIS manuscripts, the commitment to the technical precision guidelines is mandatory. These guidelines encompass aspects such as language proficiency, equation accuracy, formatting consistency, and polished presentation of figures. Therefore, in order to better contribute to the overall quality and accessibility of the scientific discourse, reviewers are kindly invited to address the following standards:

1. English: English must be of high quality. Each and every word must be accurately employed to present a concise and a straightforward meaning. The phrases should reflect the intended meaning directly with no ambiguity. To make sure that the use of abbreviations is minimized and to only permit standard abbreviations and physical units. Punctuations is to be also carefully checked. A thorough proofreading must be conducted to detect any form of plagiarism, inclusion of artificial intelligence

2. Presentation: the presented manuscript should adhere to a professional layout, ensuring a structured and polished presentation in a comprehensive manner

3. References: references should be adequate, relevant to the topic, and reviewers are kindly asked to make sure that authors do not exaggeratedly cite their own work. Reviewers are also asked to refrain from asking authors to cite the reviewer's own work in the submitted manuscripts. Inappropriate references are to be checked and prompted for removal

4. Equations: reviewers are cordially asked to actually read each and every equation in the manuscript. Mathematical entities (e.g., vectors, integrals, exponentials, etc.) are to be correspondingly assessed for validation and correctness

5. Pictures: all pictures within the manuscript must be of high quality. Reviewers are asked to encourage authors for polishing their pictures, with a sufficient resolution of 300 Dots Per Inch.

6. Introduction/conclusion: the introduction must support a good understanding of the topic, including an overview of the subject, the addressed problem(s), a brief review for other related studies, and the concrete contribution of the manuscript. The conclusion must summarize the actual finding and scientific contributions of the manuscript, without repeating sentences/ideas from the introduction or the abstract

7. Title: titles should be concise, accurately reflecting the content and focus of the research, and engaging to potential readers. It should ideally convey the main theme or contribution of the study in a clear and succinct manner. Abbreviations are to be avoided in the titles

While the outlined technical guidelines are crucial for maintaining a professional and standardized layout, it is important to express that their primary purpose is to support and enhance the evaluation of the substantive scientific contributions within the submitted paper. These guidelines serve as a framework to facilitate clear communication and rigorous assessment, with the ultimate focus on the scholarly merit and originality of the research presented. Reviewers at this point are encouraged to make a checklist delineating whether each criterion among the four main criteria is met or not. This checklist serves as a structured and tabulated assessment, facilitating a systematic evaluation of the paper's compliance with the specified criteria. The use of this checklist aims to provide a clear and organized framework for reviewers to convey their observations and judgments effectively.

D. FINAL DECISION: FROM REVIEWERS TO THE EDITOR AND TO AUTHORS

The final decision represents the culmination of a thorough examination, where the NEIS conference's reviewers have diligently navigated through each task from the three previous main sets. At this final stage, reviewers become poised to render a comprehensive judgment on the manuscript. This final decision, shaped by the collective insights gleaned throughout the proposed review process, determines the manuscript's fate in joining or not, the accepted publications. Reviewers at this stage are kindly expected to formulate their overall assessment of the paper. When submitting feedback, reviewers are kindly asked to maintain a friendly and considerate tone, ensuring that their comments contribute to a collaborative and supportive peer-review process. Reviewers are hence asked to give their final opinion to the editor, according to the following four states:

1. Accept (in present form): each task within each main set (A, B, and C) is fully satisfied (rare)

2. Accept (with minor edits): the majority of the criterion within each main set are satisfied

3. Accept (with major edits): more than half of the criterion were satisfied, still many are missing

4. Reject (do not encourage resubmission): detected plagiarism, severe insignificance, controversy, etc. (rare)

As for the communication between the reviewers and the authors, correspondent feedback must be clear and specific, directly addressing any shortcomings observed in the submitted paper based on the four main criteria outlined in this guideline.

Thank you very much for considering a review for the NEIS conference, as we look forward to your insightful contribution!
The NEIS-conference community