Submit Review

Please use this form to submit your review. For each criterion you can award certain points. The contribution to the final rating is stated in the left column below the name of each criterion.
Note that a ConfTool session is limited to two hours. Print View

Information on the Contribution	
Contribution ID	**321**
Conference Track / Type of Submission	**Workshop 123**
Title	**Assessing, conserving and using native Coffee**
Keywords	Keyword 1, Keyword 2, Keyword 3
Contribution of the submission	Please outline briefly the main contribution of this submission.

Awarding of points based on various criteria	
*** Quality of Content** 10%	○ 10 - Excellent work and a significant contribution ○ 08 - Good work, significant ○ 06 - Solid work ○ 04 - Weak content ○ 02 - Only an insignificant contribution ○ 00 - Questionable work
*** Significance for theory or practice** 10%	○ 10 - Very significant ○ 08 - Significant ○ 06 - Not bad ○ 04 - Low significance ○ 02 - Only of marginal significance ○ 00 - Absolutely insignificant
*** Originality and level of innovativeness** 10%	○ 10 - Groundbreaking ○ 08 - A pioneer work ○ 06 - One step forward ○ 04 - Better works on the same topic exist ○ 02 - This has been said several times ○ 00 - Outdated work

*** Relevance for the "Call for Papers"** 10%	☐ 10 - Appropriate to the point ☐ 08 - Definitely relevant ☐ 06 - Close enough ☐ 04 - Not really adequate ☐ 02 - Not adequate ☐ 00 - Definitely unsuitable
*** Quality of presentation** 10%	☐ 10 - Excellently written ☐ 08 - Well written ☐ 06 - Legible ☐ 04 - Needs some revision ☐ 02 - Requires considerable work ☐ 00 - Not acceptable

Decisive overall recommendation

*** Overall recommendation** 50%	☐ 10 - Definitely accept (very high quality) ☐ 09 ☐ 08 - Probably accept (good quality) ☐ 07 ☐ 06 - Lean towards acceptance (borderline quality) ☐ 05 ☐ 04 - Lean towards rejection (low quality) ☐ 03 ☐ 02 - Probably reject (minor quality) ☐ 01 ☐ 00 - Definitely reject (has no merit)

Comments on the submission

*** Comments for the authors**	Please provide an as detailed as possible explanation for your evaluation, which allows the authors to understand it. Point out strengths and weaknesses of the submitted contribution. Please also provide suggestions for improvement und use an objective and constructive writing style.

Familiarity of the reviewer with the topic

* Familiarity of the reviewer with the topic	○ 10 - Very familiar with the topic, my area of expertise ○ 08 - Good knowledge ○ 06 - More or less familiar ○ 04 - Only marginally familiar ○ 02 - Not really familiar ○ 00 - Completely new to me

Information for the program committee

Best paper award	☐ Do you think this submission is a candidate for the best paper award?
Veto against acceptance	☐ Do you have major objections against the acceptance of this submission? Please explain your veto in the internal comments.
Recommended as poster	☐ Do you recommend to accept this submission as poster only?
Major revision required	☐ This submissions requires major rework before it can be accepted.
Internal comments	These comments are only for PC members and will not be passed on to authors.

Please note: Finalized reviews cannot be edited anymore. Please finalize all reviews before the review deadline.

Submit and Finalize Review

Save as Draft