

FACADE TECTONICS INSTITUTE

PAPER REVIEWER GUIDELINES

Suggestions on Reviewing a Paper

The authors' papers might have a different outline from the one listed – that's OK. Here are issues to consider (you do not need to respond to each one individually).

Abstract

There are two goals in reviewing the abstract: determining whether the subject is innovative and interesting enough to warrant developing a full paper, and, if so, assisting the author in crafting a clear description. Unfortunately, many authors view their papers as a mystery novel, with the solution at the end. That is not the case. The abstract should be the “spoiler” and clearly state what was done, why, how, and the results, all in approximately 300 words.

- Who will be interested in this research and why?
- Is it relevant to an international interdisciplinary audience and to FTI's aims and scope?
- Does the abstract present a specific, easily identifiable contribution of knowledge? Is it applicable and useful?
- Does it seem like the abstract includes all of the main findings of the study?
- Are there excessively commercial interests represented in this paper?

Originality and Scope

- Who will be interested in this research and why?
- Is it relevant to an international interdisciplinary audience and to FTI's aims and scope?
- Does the manuscript present a specific, easily identifiable contribution to knowledge? Is it applicable and useful?
- Are there excessive commercial interests represented in this paper?

Introduction / Background

- Does the paper present a critical understanding of the relevant literature, practices, and theories?
- Does the author explain how it reinforces/alters this knowledge?
- Are there any serious omissions, particularly omissions that might affect the conclusions?
- Are the sources cited current and up to date?

Methods

- Is the research design robust?
- Are the choices of methods appropriate to the questions being explored?
- Are the limitations or uncertainties acknowledged and discussed?
- Are there any technical failures that need to be addressed?
- Is the methodology sufficiently well explained that someone else knowledgeable about the field could repeat the study?

Data and Explanation

- Are the evidence or results reliable?
- Are they conveyed clearly and concisely?
- Are the analysis and interpretation appropriate?
- Are the figures appropriate and clear?
- Are the conclusions sufficiently grounded in the evidence?

Conclusions and Future Work

- Do the conclusions demonstrate a real understanding of the subject matter?
- Are the impacts consistent with the evidence and arguments?
- Are the conclusions sound and justified? Do they follow logically from the data presented?
- Is future work presented?

Overall

- Do all elements of the manuscript relate logically to the study's statement of purpose? Is there clarity of objectives, structure, and expression?
- Are the narrative and detailed argumentation appropriate and concise?
- Do the title and abstract accurately describe the contents?
- Does the abstract include all of the main findings of the study?
- Are the terms and contexts explained clearly for an international audience?
- Are all references pertinent and complete?

For any questions, please contact our 2026 World Congress team at:

papers@facadetectonics.org

Visit the [2026 World Congress page](#) for detailed information, September 28 - October 2, 2026, Pittsburgh, PA.