International Symposium on **S**eismic Risk, **U**rbanization, and **RE**silience in
the Western **MED**iterranean (**SURE-MED**)
40 Years After the Constantine Earthquake of October 27, 1985

October 27-29, 2025 | Constantine, Algeria

SURE-MED2025 — Reviewer's Guide (One-Page Abstract)
(Maximum: 350 words including title, authors, affiliations, abstract, and keywords)

Abstract Reviewer's Guide

Introduction

Welcome, and thank you for your participation as a reviewer for the SURE-MED 2025 Symposium. Your role is essential to the success and scientific integrity of this event. A fair and rigorous review process ensures that the research presented is of the highest quality, relevant, and impactful. This initial evaluation of abstracts is the critical first step in that process.

Your careful and consistent scoring will not only determine which abstracts are accepted for presentation but will also directly influence the selection of extended abstracts for the SURE-MED 2025 Springer proceedings, which requires a more in-depth peer review. Furthermore, your scores will contribute to the selection of the prestigious **SURE-MED 2025 Best Contribution Award**.

The SURE-MED 2025 symposium uses a single-blind peer review system. As a reviewer, your identity will remain anonymous to the authors. However, your review reports will be shared with the authors, who will have the opportunity to provide a rebuttal to address your comments and critiques. Each abstract will be assigned to a minimum of two reviewers to ensure a balanced and fair assessment. You have the flexibility to consult other reviewers' reports after you have submitted your own independent assessment, and you can edit your report before the final deadline of this first review round.

This guide provides a concise framework for effectively and consistently evaluating and scoring the abstracts assigned to you.

Part I: Core Evaluation Criteria

Please use the following criteria and rubrics to score each abstract on a scale of **1 to 5**, where:
- **5 = Excellent:** Exceeds expectations
- **4 = Good:** Meets all expectations
- **3 = Adequate:** Meets some expectations but needs improvement
- **2 = Poor:** Fails to meet expectations
- **1 = Unacceptable:** Fails to meet basic requirements

Note: At the end of your evaluation, you will be asked to provide a **cumulative score out of 20** based on the sum of your ratings for these four criteria.

International Symposium on **S**eismic Risk, **U**rbanization, and **RE**silience in
the Western **MED**iterranean (**SURE-MED**)
40 Years After the Constantine Earthquake of October 27, 1985

October 27-29, 2025 | Constantine, Algeria

1. *Relevance and Scientific Significance*

This criterion assesses how well the abstract aligns with the symposium's core themes (seismic risk, urbanization, and resilience in the Western Mediterranean) and the overall importance of the research.

- **5 (Excellent):** The research is highly relevant to SURE-MED's core objectives and addresses a major problem or knowledge gap, making a significant contribution to the field.
- **4 (Good):** The abstract is clearly relevant to the symposium's scope and at least one scientific session. It addresses an important problem with a meaningful contribution.
- **3 (Adequate):** The abstract is moderately relevant, within the general field but may not directly align with a specific session, or it addresses a problem of limited significance.
- **2 (Poor):** The abstract is poorly relevant or only loosely related to the symposium's themes. The research problem is unclear or lacks scientific importance.
- **1 (Unacceptable):** The research is not relevant to the scope of SURE-MED and falls outside the defined scientific themes.

2. *Scientific Merit and Abstract Structure*

This criterion evaluates the clarity and rigor of the abstract's scientific communication. For most studies, this means following the **IMRaD** (Introduction, Methods, Results, and Discussion) structure.

- **5 (Excellent):** The abstract is exceptionally well-structured and concise. All five scientific elements (Context, Objectives, Methods, Key Results, and Interpretation/Conclusion) are presented clearly in a logical and balanced manner.
- **4 (Good):** The abstract is well-structured and contains all five elements, though they may be slightly unbalanced. The logical flow is clear and easy to follow.
- **3 (Adequate):** The abstract is somewhat structured, but one or more key elements are either missing or poorly defined, requiring the reviewer to make some inferences.
- **2 (Poor):** The abstract is poorly structured and difficult to follow. Several key elements are missing, and the connections between sections are not intuitive.
- **1 (Unacceptable):** The abstract is completely unstructured and disorganized, making it impossible to identify the study design, methods, results, or conclusions.

Note: The IMRaD framework is typical for research papers. For other types of studies, such as review papers, historical analyses, or syntheses, the elements may differ. In these cases, please evaluate the abstract based on its overall flow and the quality of the background information and conclusions.

3. *Novelty and Scientific Contribution*

International Symposium on **S**eismic Risk, **U**rbanization, and **RE**silience in
the Western **MED**iterranean (**SURE-MED**)
40 Years After the Constantine Earthquake of October 27, 1985

October 27-29, 2025 | Constantine, Algeria

This criterion assesses the originality of the research and its potential impact on the field.

- **5 (Excellent):** The abstract presents a highly original idea, a unique methodology, or a new approach to a significant problem. It is likely to have a substantial impact on the field.
- **4 (Good):** The research makes a significant contribution with meaningful outcomes. It builds upon existing research in a novel way that advances the field.
- **3 (Adequate):** The research makes a solid contribution but is largely based on a straightforward or established methodology. It is a modest or incremental addition to the existing literature.
- **2 (Poor):** The research is a minor modification of a similar published study or duplicates existing work. It offers a minimal contribution to the field.
- **1 (Unacceptable):** The research is unoriginal, based on a flawed premise, or completely lacks any scientific contribution.

4. *Clarity and Quality of Communication*

This criterion evaluates the professionalism, readability, and overall quality of the writing in the abstract.

- **5 (Excellent):** The abstract is exceptionally well-written. It is clear, concise, and professional, with no grammatical, spelling, or punctuation errors. The logical flow is seamless.
- **4 (Good)::** The abstract is well-written with only a few minor technical or language issues that do not impede understanding. The communication is effective.
- **3 (Adequate):** The abstract is moderately well-written and requires some language improvement. It may have grammatical issues or awkward phrasing, but the core meaning is still ascertainable.
- **2 (Poor):):** The abstract is poorly written with significant language issues. It is disjointed and challenging to understand the core message.
- **1 (Unacceptable):** The abstract is so poorly written that it is impossible to understand its meaning or intent.

Part II: Supplemental Evaluation Sections

In addition to your numerical scores, please provide qualitative feedback using the following sections. This feedback is invaluable for both the organizing committee and the authors, helping them to improve their work.

- **Potential for Extended Abstract:** Recommend if this abstract warrants a full paper for consideration in the SURE-MED 2025 Springer proceedings.
- **Recommended Presentation Format:** Suggest whether the research is best suited for an

International Symposium on **S**eismic Risk, **U**rbanization, and **RE**silience in the Western **MED**iterranean (**SURE-MED**)
40 Years After the Constantine Earthquake of October 27, 1985

October 27-29, 2025 | Constantine, Algeria

Oral or a **Poster** presentation.

- **Recommended Thematic Session:** Please identify which of the five SURE-MED scientific sessions is most appropriate for this abstract.
- **General Comments (Optional but Crucial):** Please provide nuanced and constructive feedback. Your comments should explain the rationale behind your scores and offer specific suggestions for improvement.

Your diligent and consistent reviews are the foundation of SURE-MED 2025's academic integrity and are key to identifying the very best contributions. Thank you again for your time and expertise.