

Crossrail Technical Papers Competition Reviewers

Adopt a positive, impartial, but critical attitude toward the manuscript under review, with the aim of promoting effective, accurate, and relevant communication. The aim of the competition is two fold:

- i) Generate a stock of papers for publication of compendium volumes and
- ii) Technical approval for external conferences/publications.

Please consider the following additional aspects when reviewing a manuscript:

The submission should focus on a technical discussion and not be for promotional purposes

The paper must not be overly critical of the project either directly or implied

The submission must not focus on unresolved construction risks

The submission should deal with completed phases of work that have been delivered successfully but can make recommendations for subsequent phases of work.

Originality (20/100)

Appropriateness of the approach or design as described in the submission (20/100)

Soundness of conclusions and interpretation (20/100)

Relevance of discussion (20/100)

Appropriateness of title and abstract (10/100)

Appropriateness of figures and tables (10/100)

Length

You are not required to correct deficiencies of style, syntax, or grammar, but any help you can give in clarifying meaning will be appreciated.

Paper No:
Title:

Points to consider

Have the authors worked on the project or that piece of work?
Is the article specific to the Crossrail project?
Does the abstract give an indication that the paper fulfill the requirements for the full paper outlined below?

Please also consider the following additional aspects when reviewing a manuscript:
The submission should focus on a technical discussion rather than be for promotional purposes
The paper should not be overly critical of the project either directly or implied
The submission should not focus on unresolved construction risks
The submission should deal with completed phases of work that have been delivered successfully.
Recommendations can be made for subsequent phases of work.

Originality (20/100)	
Appropriateness of the approach or design as described in the submission (20/100)	
Soundness of conclusions and interpretation (20/100)	
Relevance of discussion (20/100)	
Appropriateness of title and abstract (10/100)	
Appropriateness of figures and tables (10/100)	
Length Comment:	
Total	0