# Guidelines for Manuscript Review

| Category | Rating | Description |
|---|---|---|
| **Appropriateness** | Excellent | The manuscript is an excellent example of the type of material that SPIE should publish. |
| | Good | Appropriate for this series. |
| | Satisfactory | This manuscript fits the series, but others might be just as appropriate. |
| | Marginal | I'm not sure this manuscript should be published in this series. |
| | Poor | This manuscript is completely inappropriate for this series. It should be reclassified or rejected. |
| **Quality of Writing** | Excellent | Highly readable. Well written and easy to read. |
| | Good | Readable. |
| | Satisfactory | Readable, but the clarity could be improved. |
| | Marginal | Difficult to read; it needs rewriting. |
| | Poor | Impossible to read. Should be rejected on the basis of writing alone. |
| **Organization and Clarity** | Excellent | A well-structured exposition of the material that is easy to understand. |
| | Good | The manuscript is organized and clear. No real problems. |
| | Satisfactory | There are concepts or results that are unclear, or the organization of the manuscript needs revision. |
| | Marginal | The manuscript's organization and clarity are poor and must be revised. |
| | Poor | Haphazard organization and unclear concepts make this manuscript impossible to understand. Reject and suggest a complete rewrite. |
| **Length** | Excellent | The manuscript is sufficiently long enough without being wordy. |
| | Good | The length of the manuscript is reasonable, but it could be improved. |
| | Satisfactory | The manuscript is too wordy and needs to be cut to be effective. |
| | Marginal | There are insufficient details for this to be considered an accurate description of the research. |
| | Poor | This manuscript is either too long and needs to be cut drastically or too short to be of any use. It should be rejected and resubmitted. |
| **References** | Excellent | A strong, comprehensive reference list. No improvements needed. |
| | Good | Good reference list. |
| | Satisfactory | Weak reference list. Needs additional sources to be complete. |
| | Marginal | Poor reference list. There are insufficient sources to support the material. |
| | Poor | The reference list is missing major sources to place the current research in a correct context. |
| **Relevance of Figures** | Excellent | Excellent graphics that illuminate the text. |
| | Good | The graphics are appropriate to the text and its contents. |
| | Satisfactory | The figures could use revision to increase comprehension or readability. |
| | Marginal | The figures are poorly drawn and require revision to be useful. |
| | Poor | Lacks figures to make the text comprehensible, or they are so poorly drawn as to be useless. |
| **Technical Accuracy** | Excellent | The manuscript is technically flawless. |
| | Good | The manuscript is technically accurate, but some minor improvements would improve it. |
| | Satisfactory | There are minor inaccuracies that must be corrected. |
| | Marginal | There is a major inaccuracy that must be corrected. |
| | Poor | There are numerous inaccuracies; it should be rejected. |
| **Detail Level** | Excellent | The numerous details make the manuscript easily understandable, and no changes have been identified that could improve it. |
| | Good | The details are sufficient. Minor improvements may improve the manuscript, but are not necessary. |
| | Satisfactory | The manuscript lacks some details. |
| | Marginal | There are a number of crucial details missing. |
| | Poor | There are so few details that it is impossible to judge the manuscript's worth. It should be rejected. |