

M&C 2005 GUIDELINES AND ACCEPTANCE CRITERIA FOR EXTENDED SUMMARIES

As opposed to previous M&C topical meeting, the review for M&C 2005 will be based in extended abstracts, not papers. The abstract should give an idea of the contents of the final paper and contain evidence that the work has been done. The following criteria have been adapted from the rules provided by the M&C Division.

As our name implies, our division is interested in both the mathematical and computational aspects of all of the ANS division work areas. The following are considered guidelines for acceptable contributed M&C Division papers and are intended to augment the general ANS acceptance guidelines. All papers should include:

New and original work of interest to the ANS MCD membership including:

- 】 A new mathematical theory or computational method; or
- 】 A new understanding of existing methods such as algorithm approximations, new mathematical or computational benchmark comparisons, or comparisons of results on new computer architectures; or
- 】 A new physical model or analysis or computational technique of a nuclear system or nuclear application

The relationship of the new work to existing pertinent literature should be defined;

The new aspects of the work should be clearly described (e.g., so that any algorithm involved can be understood);

Except for new mathematical proofs and analytical solutions, numerical results ARE REQUIRED. Where possible, comparisons for accuracy and computational efficiency should be made with related methods that are currently in widespread use;

Sound conclusions based on the new work should be made.

An acceptable paper should reflect the contents and scope of the work and provide sufficient purpose, background description, and results to be understandable and informative.

The acceptance criteria may be relaxed as the discretion of the Chair of the Program Committee for summaries submitted to special sessions (review summaries and others)

ETHICS OF THE REVIEW PROCESS

Reviewers are reminded that access to the abstracts is deliberately and strictly limited. The abstracts are available solely for the purpose of conducting the review. Any other use of the abstracts is considered a violation of professional and ethical standards. For example, reviewers:

- 】 should not distribute abstracts in any format except as an aid to complete their review;
- 】 should not discuss or disseminate abstracts content except to enhance their review;
- 】 should not discuss comments outside of the context of the actual abstract review. Authors may be in the process of preparing other papers or journal articles, and there is an implied agreement that reviewers will not dilute those efforts by “letting the word out”. Avoid conflicts of interest: do not review abstracts by co-workers or abstracts where you have contributed.

Please use your best judgment in these matters.

When composing your comments please note:

- 】 your comments (without your identity) will be conveyed to the author.
- 】 for the above reason, please, be professional and responsible.
- 】 your review is concerned exclusively with the work as presented in the abstract.
- 】 please, refrain from using the review comments for other purposes, including informal discussion with authors or other reviewers, general or personal criticism of the author, etc.
- 】 while you may ask co-workers to help you review abstracts, you are responsible for the professional conduct of the review and for all comments presented therein.