

Reminders to the Editors of THE BIOPHILIA

Date: Oct.1, 2011

The BIOPHILIA Editing Committee

1. Request from the committee to the reviewer.
 - 1.1 Please examine the enclosed paper according to the following instructions.
 - 1.1.1 We require two individual examinations (done by two individual reviewers) per paper.
 - 1.1.2 Although the final decision of accepting the paper for publication will be carried out by the Academy's Editing Committee, we will generally follow through with the reviewers' decision if the two agree with one decision. Otherwise, the right to decide will remain with the Academy.
 - 1.1.3 Individual names of reviewers will not be announced outside the Academy Editing Committee.
 - 1.1.4 Any questions or comments to the author should be forwarded to the Editing Committee.
 - 1.1.5 If the paper is not possible to examine for whatever reason, please return it within 2-3 days along with a recommendation of another reviewer, if possible.
 - 1.1.6 Please evaluate the paper according to the Evaluation Report to the Biophilia Editing Committee.

Recommendation of reviewer (if possible)
Name
Position
Telephone
e-mail

- 1.2 Deadlines should be strictly followed.

The principle deadline for the examination will be within 3 weeks after the date sent.

Remarks

The definition of us about the following evaluation concepts

1 Originality:

Whether the paper has a sense of a new creation, and includes such items as new concepts, techniques, device or methods.

2 Significance:

Whether the paper gives satisfactory answers to questions such as, "Why was this work done?" and "What is the significance of the work?"

3 Completeness:

Whether each part in the paper has a completeness of its own, and has interdependence between each other— no part should be missing without destroying the integrity of the paper.

4 Organization/logicality:

Whether there is a carefully planned, logical structure in the paper.

5 Quotation of References:

Whether the author has done a thorough research to gather facts that give definite proof to the paper.

A. Honor quality:

Papers that have an outstanding writing quality, a high degree of originality, and constitutes an unusual contribution to the objective field.

B. Good:

Papers that indicate very acceptable levels of accomplishment. A paper with profile components rated at this level would be presentable for publication in the journal.

C. Acceptable:

Papers that indicate acceptable components, these may vary according to the examiner.

D. Poor:

Papers that include excessive commercialism, fallacious analysis, or repetitive description of conventional engineering practices.