



DFI Journal Reviewer Guidelines

Thank you for agreeing to serve as a reviewer for the DFI Journal: The Journal of the Deep Foundations Institute. Following are guidelines and criteria to be taken into consideration as you evaluate a paper. Your recommendations will be considered by the editors who will make the final decision on whether or not the paper will be selected for publication in a Journal volume and your comments/edits will be provided to the author anonymously so they can properly modify their paper for publication. All papers will have at least three reviews performed for the editors' consideration and in most cases the editors will follow the majority of the reviewers, but in some cases, that may not happen. In such cases the editors will provide their own review, indicating the reasons for their decision.

PURPOSE OF REVIEW

The primary purpose of your review is to improve the technical quality of the submission and provide a recommendation to the editors.

REVIEW PROCESS

Once you are chosen to serve as a reviewer, you will receive an email instructing you to logon to the peer review website, www.paperreview.com using the ID: "dfijournal", your email address and the password provided to you. Once logged on, you will see the list of papers to which you have been assigned. To download a PDF copy of a paper, you click on the paper title. ***We ask that you keep the copy of your paper private and do not distribute it to anyone. Access to the paper is solely to allow you to review it.*

After you have read the paper, you enter your evaluation by clicking on the "Evaluate" link. There you will find a rating form which allows you to rank the paper by assigning a value of 1-5 to the various criteria. We advise the evaluation form be viewed prior to reading the paper. The evaluation form also includes space for you to enter comments to the authors and to the editors (coordinators). Your ranking and comments to the author are the only information visible to the author while the comments to the coordinators will only be viewable by the editors.

Generally, it is requested that you complete your review and enter your evaluations within 3 weeks of your assignment. If you are unable to meet the deadline for any reason, you should advise the

Journal Administrator or decline the review immediately so another reviewer can be identified.

PAPER EVALUATION

There are two components to your paper review: (1) technical content and (2) quality of paper presentation. Either or both of these can be grounds for rejection of the submission and both should be considered when reviewing the paper.

I. Technical Content

Although there is no simple formula for what is acceptable technical content, there are some basic principles you can apply.

- **Relevance:** First and foremost it should be considered whether or not the submission fits the following mission of the DFI Journal:

The Journal of the Deep Foundations Institute publishes practice-oriented, high quality papers related to the broad area of "Deep Foundations Engineering". Papers are welcome on topics of interest to the geo-professional community related to, all systems designed and constructed for the support of heavy structures and excavations, but not limited to, different piling systems, drilled shafts, ground modification geosystems, soil nailing and anchors. Authors are also encouraged to submit papers on new and emerging topics related to innovative construction technologies, marine foundations, innovative retaining systems, cutoff wall systems, and seismic retrofit. Case histories, state of the practice reviews, and innovative applications are particularly welcomed and encouraged.

- Originality: Papers which have previously been published may or may not be acceptable to the DFI Journal. If the submission is simply a duplication of another published paper then it is probably unacceptable. However if the submission expands on previously published data and is considered valuable to the DFI Journal readership, the paper is likely acceptable.
- References as support of statements: The reviewer should request that references be provided by the author where they believe they are required and were not provided. Requesting the original source of information be referenced will substantiate statements and make them more credible to the readers. Reviewers may also request a copy of the original documents being referenced to assist them in substantiating the statements.
- Speculation and personal opinion: Both should be considered unacceptable and limited within the paper.
- Significance of Results: Authors should provide statistical information to support any calculations provided in the paper.
- Commercial Content: Submissions should not be written to promote a particular product, service or company but rather provide valuable information on techniques. Papers written for commercial or private advantage are not acceptable.

2. Quality of Presentation

Again there is no simple formula for a successful paper presentation. Various writing styles are acceptable to allow the authors to express themselves in their own unique way. However below are general requirements that should be considered and following these reviewer guidelines is a copy of the author guidelines for reference.

- Quality of Figures: Figures should be legible and easy to understand. They should support the information provided in the paper and properly referenced within the text. Use of computer-generated graphs or figures should be encouraged rather than scans or handwritten copies.

- Quality of English language: As the DFI Journal will be published in English, it is important that the spelling, grammar, word usage, punctuation, etc. of the text be carefully scrutinized. If the reviewer feels the paper is not readable, the paper may be rejected solely on those grounds.
- Organization: Although the organization of a paper is also a style issue, the paper content should be presented in a manner that is easy to follow for the reader. Reviewers should make recommendations on reorganization of a paper if necessary.
- Completeness: It is important to ensure that all material necessary for the overall presentation of the paper is included, i.e., appropriate citations in the reference list, descriptive captions on all figures and tables, and conclusions substantiated by statements within the previous text.

Evaluation and Recommendation

Your online evaluation should include detailed comments to the author describing any shortcomings of the paper and recommending changes that will address these shortcomings. If the reviewer finds it absolutely necessary to mark up the PDF copy of the paper in order to illustrate to the author the recommendations for improvement, the marked up paper will need to be emailed to the administrator at uvch@dfi.org. The administrator will forward the marked up copy to the author under separate cover. This is not the preferred method of evaluation. Reviewers are encouraged to address all concerns as comments within the online evaluation form, however we realize there are exceptions which require other methods of communication.

Additionally, the reviewer must make a recommendation to the editors on the evaluation form indicating if the paper is 1) acceptable as is; 2) acceptable with mandatory changes or 3) declined.

Most likely the recommendation will be #2 or 3 for the first round of review. A reviewer will be notified when a paper is resubmitted by the author. At that time the reviewer will be required to resubmit their evaluation within the typical timeframe of one week. If necessary a third round of review may be required.



DFI Journal Author Guidelines

<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Call For Papers	Ongoing
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Notify Authors if paper moving into Peer Review	Within 3 months of submission
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Notify Authors if accepted for publication	Within 6 months of submission
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Authors confirm willingness to provide Final paper and supplemental graphic files	Within 2 weeks of notification of acceptance for publication
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Final Papers, Keywords & Copyright Agreement Due	Within 1 month of notification of acceptance for publication

Following is a document to assist you in finalizing your paper for publication.

Recommendations for Preparation of a Technical Paper

Arthur A. Author, ABC Company, Anywhere, State, USA; Phone Number; Email Address

Bob B. Author, XYZ Company, Anywhere, Province, Country

Deep Foundations Institute offers these recommendations for preparation of a technical paper as a means of providing some guidance to authors preparing papers for publication in the DFI Journal. Following these recommendations will ensure a reasonable degree of uniformity of the papers received for publication. Grateful acknowledgment is offered for the contribution of Bengt H. Fellenius, DFI member and Professor Emeritus of the University of Ottawa. His paper, written many years ago, entitled "Instructions For Preparing A Manuscript" is the backbone of this document, which quotes much of his work verbatim and differs primarily due to updates to incorporate more recent word processing and computer capabilities.

FORMAT

Lay-out

Authors are not required to format their paper but they are required to submit their paper by electronic upload to www.dfi-journal.org in one of the following file formats:

- Microsoft Word
- Corel WordPerfect
- Rich Text Format
- Lotus Freelance
- Microsoft PowerPoint
- (La)TeX (A DVI and associated EPS files must be submitted)
- Adobe PageMaker
- Adobe FrameMaker
- Lotus Word Pro

Additionally all images, including graphs, tables, charts, figures, photos, etc. must be submitted as separate high resolution files of at least 300 dpi. To submit your graphics, create a folder on your computer and store all images in there. Then zip the folder to create one zipped file. Use the "Upload Ancillary File" link on your login home page to upload this zipped file.

Each paper must begin with the title which should not exceed 90 characters including spaces between words.

Each author's name, affiliation, city, state, and country must be included below the title and the main author's phone number and email address are also to be included.

An abstract should be placed following the author names to summarize the paper's content.

Graphics, such as graphs, charts, tables, figures, photos, etc. may be embedded within the document to show preference of placement within text for final published copy or text indications/instructions of where graphics should be placed should be communicated to editors.

Do not use page numbers in your document since the Journal Production company will number the pages contiguously.

Use of headings to separate sections of the paper is suggested. The headings need not be numbered but should be Bold Type and Underlined so easily identifiable to editors.

Tables & Figures

Tables and Figures should be placed in the text after and in immediate connection to where they are first mentioned. If authors do not embed them in the document or indicate where they are to be placed, placement will be at the discretion of the editors. Refer to tables and figures within the text, for example the second table, write "Table 2", or for third figure state, "as shown in Figure 3" or "see figure 3". Also please remember to include captions for tables, figures and photos.

Use computer-generated graphs or figures. **Make all lines thick (heavy; wide) and the lines in the graph about twice as thick as the width used for the axes in the diagram.**

Graphics and/or Photos

The integration of line-graphics and photographs into the text of a manuscript provides easier reference for the reader.

The alternative is to group all graphics and photographs as an addendum following the text. In this case, the illustrations should appear in the order of mention and be captioned with sequential figure numbers, which are referenced at the appropriate places in the foregoing text. . **Final paper graphics and photos should be submitted in color when possible.**

Manuscript Length

The length of a paper is maximized to 15 pages (~10,000 words without any graphics or an average of 7,500 words with graphics). Failing special arrangements having been made, over length papers may be returned for additional editing to meet length requirements.

Deadline for Receipt

To enable a paper to be included in the Journal volume for which it has been accepted, the file must have been received by the date requested. Papers failing to meet the deadline for receipt may not be included in that volume or future volumes.

Definitions, Symbols, And Units

There is an abominable proliferation of terms, definitions, symbols, and units used in papers written by the piling community. Not only do the terms vary between authors, many authors use several different words for the same thing in the same paper, which makes the papers difficult to read and conveys an impression of poor professional quality.

In the following guidelines, suggestions are made for unifying the style of the papers for the Journal.

Summary

As previously mentioned, all papers should have a summary (abstract) placed at the beginning of the main body of text immediately below the title. The

maximum length of the Summary is half a page (~300 words).

The Summary presents, but only very briefly, the background, objectives, and scope of the work presented in the paper and emphasizes the results and the conclusions from the work. Do not write "This paper presents the results from field tests comparing polymorganic piles with monogamic piles and comments on the economics of the new piles". Such a sentence is only descriptive and provides very little useful information. Instead, concentrate on the factual information and write: "Results from full-scale static loading tests to failure loads of about 5,000 KN showed that the stiffness of polymorganic piles was four times smaller than that of monogamic piles. Compilation of construction costs from three projects showed that neither pile type was competitive with conventional wood piles."

Conclusions

With the possible exception of some case history papers, the paper should finish with a section called Conclusions that reiterates the results and conclusions developed in the paper.

Literature References

Where previously published literature is referred to, a listing of all references is to be compiled at the end of the paper immediately following the summary under the heading of "References".

References in the text

References in the text are cited by the last name of the author(s) followed by the year of publication in parentheses. If more than two authors exist for a paper, use the first author's name followed by "et al.", which words stand for "et al." (Means "and others"). Do not forget to include the period in "al.". When the reference is not a noun or an object in a sentence, both the (name) and year(s) are placed in parentheses and separated by a comma.

If there is more than one paper cited within the parentheses, place the references in chronological order and separate them by semicolons.

When reference is made to more than one paper by the same author(s) published during the same year, denote the references by 1984a, 1984b, etc. with "a", "b", etc. determined by alphabetical order from the first word in the title.

The following are examples of the assigned format for references in the text:

Jones (1982) found the obfuscation coefficient, C , to be equal to 1.403.

The results of their study were in agreement with the findings of Herremann (1983), Gragossen et al. (1974), and Laurel and Hardy (1981).

A number of researchers (Lilflickanovitz, 1932; Sellers, 1957; 1962; Raringen and Gosingen, 1974; Churchill et al., 1981; and Zorroc, 1981) have reported similar phenomena.

The findings reported by Wroom (1977; 1981) and Zolac (1976a; 1976b) enabled Pzist and Topf (1983) to formulate the general theory of mudcake activated communal oscillations.

Subsequently, the continued testing had to be significantly expanded to eliminate the consequence of elated shaft excitation on the dynamically sensitive rackare and busar at the site (Fint and Snus, 1982; Samt and Synnerligt, 1983; and Jag et al., 1983).

Reference list

The primary order of listing the papers is alphabetically according to the name of the author (first author, when there is more than one author for the reference). The second order is according to the year of publication.

Start the reference by the name of the author(s) in capital letters and then write the year of publication after which a period is entered. The title of the paper is written without capital letters (but for the first letter) and ended with a period. After the title, write the name of the publication in full followed by volume identification, etc. Do not attempt to abbreviate the name of journals,

publications, conferences, etc., but spell out all letters. Finally, the page numbers for the first and the last page are given, or, if there is no pagination or if the reference is a book in full, the number of pages of the reference is given.

The following is an example of a reference list attempting to cover most of the various types of texts encountered. Notice, for instance, that the references to the ASCE journal reflect the changes made in the name of the journal:

Canadian Foundation Engineering Manual, 1985. Second Edition, Part 1: Fundamentals; Part 2: Shallow Foundations; Part 3: Deep Foundations; Part 4: Excavations and Retaining Structures. Canadian Geotechnical Society, BiTech Publishers, Vancouver, 456 p.

Fellenius, B. H., 1980. The analysis of results from routine pile loading tests. Ground Engineering, Foundation Publishing Ltd., London, vol. 13, No. 6, pp. 19-31.

Goble, G. G., Rausche, F., and Likins, G.E., 1980. The analysis of pile driving – a state-of-the-art. Proceedings of the First International Conference on the Application of Stress- wave Theory on Piles, Stockholm, H. Bredenberg, Editor, A. A. Balkema Publishers, pp. 131-161.

Holtz, R. D. and Kovacs, W., D., 1981. An introduction to geotechnical engineering. Prentice-Hall Inc., New York, 780 p.

Rausche, F., Moses, F., and Goble, G. 1972. Soil resistance predictions from pile dynamics. American Society of Civil Engineers, ASCE Journal for Soil Mechanics and Foundation Engineering, Vol. 98, SM9 pp. 917-937.

Rausche, F., Goble, G. G., and Likins, G. E., 1985. Dynamic determination of pile capacity. American Society of Civil Engineers, ASCE Journal of Geotechnical Engineering, Vol. III, No. 3, pp. 367-383.

Rempe, D.M. and Davisson, M.T., 1977. Performance of diesel pile hammers. Proceedings of the 9th International Conference on Soil Mechanics and Foundation Engineering, Tokyo, vol. 2, pp. 347- 354.

Smith, E. A. L., 1960. Pile driving analysis by the wave equation. American Society of Civil Engineers, ASCE Journal for Soil Mechanics and Foundation Engineering, vol. 86, SM4, pp. 35-61.

Skrivare, L. A. T., 1979. The saturated unit weight or blue bull feathers. Lecture Notes. University of Ottawa, Faculty of Engineering, Department of Civil Engineering, 13 p.

Tavenas, F. A., 1977. Application of the wave equation analysis to friction piles in sand. Canadian Geotechnical Journal, Vol. 14, No. 4, pp. 34-51.

Thompson, C.D. and Thompson, D.E., 1978. Influence of driving stresses on the development of high capacities. American Society for Testing and Materials, Symposium on Behavior of Deep Foundations, R. Lundgren, Editor, Special Technical Publication, ASTM STP 670, pp. 562-577.

Spelling Rules And Special Aspects

There are two spelling conventions in the English language, American and British: behavior (behaviour), labor (labour), color (colour), harbor (harbour), gage (gauge), neighbor (neighbour), and remold (remould). Also, modeling (modelling), referring (referring), preferred (preferred), traveling (travelling), and controled (controlled). However, occurred and occurring, offered and offering, for example, are spelled the same in both conventions, for reasons of pronunciation and stress. Choose either convention, but be consistent in the chosen one.

There is often confusion about whether to write "z" or "s" in words such as "analyze", "analyzing", "analyzer", "emphasize", "organ-ize", "capitalize", "idealize", "rationalize", "real-ize", "specialize", "summarize", "symbolize", and "horizontal".

Use the spelling "to advise" and "to practise" and "the advice" and "the practice" (verb versus noun), and omit "e" before "able" in "drivability", "desirable", "lovable", "arguable", etc. However, for reasons of pronunciation, the "e" is retained in "serviceability".

A simple and useful distinction of meanings can be made by writing "metre" for distance and "meter" when referring to a measuring device. Similarly,

the spelling "programme" as in "testing programme" keeps the meaning apart from "program" as in "computer program".

Write either "centre" or "center", but use the correct verb forms: "centred" and "centered", respectively.

Do not use contractions such as "don't" or "can't". Write "do not" and "cannot". Also, write "it is", not "it's" or "its". Besides, "its" is a possessive pronoun that must not be written "it's".

Do not overuse nouns as adjectives. Four nouns in a row is an abomination. For instance, "the concrete pile toe capacity" reads much better if changed to "the toe capacity of the concrete pile" (and, replace the word "capacity" with "resistance" or "bearing").

Do not use the ampersand symbol (&), write out the "and".

Capitalize all months, days, and seasons. Short paragraphs will make the paper more readable. Limit the text to one statement or message per paragraph.

Use plain English and common words rather than fancy expressions, and be concise and avoid lengthy or awkward constructions. Use short sentences. If a sentence requires more than three lines, it is usually better to change it into two sentences.

Think of the literal meaning of words and expressions, to avoid 'ear-sores' such as "up to a depth of 4.5 metre".

The words "the same order of magnitude" imply a relation of ten! Usually, the intended meaning is better expressed by plain "magnitude" or "size",

Many times, the words "precision" and "accuracy" are confused. An example of "precision" is the reading precision of a gauge, the number of decimals given in a value. "Accuracy" considers errors in the gauge and in a combination of measurements and calculations. Some authors will write "the accuracy of the prediction of capacity was 3%", but mean "precision". The accuracy in

prediction of pile capacity can never be as good as 3 percent!

Do not abuse the word "predict" by using it as synonymous with "calculate", "determine", or "compute". The word "prediction" is an absolute word that requires that the calculation truly was made before the test. True prediction is a rare flower!

Avoid the term "reliability" unless dealing with an analysis based on probabilistic principles.

When using a word processor and writing "Fig. 5", "Author B. C.", "i. e.", "e. g.", and other words using an abbreviation period, the automatic justification of the lines may result in too wide a space after the period, e. g., Fig. 5", "e. g.", and Author B. C". To avoid this, always follow the abbreviation period with a no-break-space command. This is particularly necessary in the Reference section.

Do not leave a numeral alone at the end of a line. For example avoid a sentence structure with "16 MPa" where the 16 is "orphaned". Use a non-break space command between numerals units for getting "16 MPa" to always be on the same line.

It is acceptable, indeed preferable, to capitalize the prefix in "KPa", "kN", etc., instead of writing "kPa", "kN", but be consistent.

Notice "kg" should be considered as one symbol and requires lower case "k". Never use "Mg" to mean "1,000 kg"! The unit "gramme" is not a base SI-unit.

Refer to a pile as, for example, Pile 57, using a capital "P". Similarly, write Day 7, Section 3.2, Site A, Blow 5, Page 9, etc. without use of the term "Number" or its abbreviation "No.". But when you do, write pile No. 57, blow No. 5, page No. 9, etc., without a capital first letter in the 'title word'.

Work on the interpunctuation. Commas are important for assisting the understanding of the text and must not be neglected. Use the convention of the "serial comma". Thus, write "red, white, and blue" with a comma separating each item in the series.

Notice that there is a difference of meaning between "Also, the experiments showed that..." and "Also the experiments showed that..." and use a comma in sentences such as: "In Fig. 16, the traces are..." Commas are important. Consider the life and death importance of whether Caesar's decision about your appeal of mercy reads "Execute, not liberate", or "Execute not, liberate".

Notice also that there is often a difference between similar words. For instance, the words "objective" and "object" are often confused, and the word "anybody" means "anyone". "Any body" means "any corpse". Similarly, "any one" means "any single person". The words "alternate" and "alternative" have related but different meanings: "Alternate" refers to every second in a series, and "alternative" is one of two possibilities. The word "alternate", but not the word "alternative" can sometimes mean "substitute". The word "substitute" is then to be preferred.

It is vexatious when "settlement" is used to mean "movement", "deformation", "deflection", etc., which blunder is very frequently found in piling papers. Load-transfer effects do not cause settlement, but movement, etc. Settlement is time dependent and is movement occurring during constant stress.

The word "less" is overused. Whenever possible, replace it by its various equivalents, such as "fewer", "smaller", "lighter", "lower", "poorer", etc.

Notice that a verbal message can be spoken or written, heard or read. If you want to say that the message is spoken as opposed to written, say "oral".

The word "data" is a plural word. So are also the words "criteria", "formulae", "media", "memoranda", "phenomena", "apparata", as well as "strata". Therefore, also the appertained verb must be in plural form. The corresponding singular words are "datum", "criterion", "formula", "medium", "memorandum", "phenomenon", "apparatus", and "stratum".

Puristically, "in-situ" should be written in italics, but hyphenating it provides sufficient distinction, Do not write "insitu", or "in situ".

Prefixes such as "pre-" are normally unnecessary. For example the word "predominant" can often be just "dominant" (and preferably be replaced by words such as "governing", "principal", "leading", etc.)

Avoid tautologies such as "warm heat", "cold chill", and "ultimate capacity". "Capacity" alone is enough. Terms such as "load capacity", "allowable capacity" are incorrect and must not be used.

|