

# Information on the Contribution

**Contribution ID** 163

**Title** **An experimental comparison of different metaheuristics for the Master Bay Plan Problem**

**Assigned topics** Heuristics for Combinatorial Optimization, Logistics and Operations Management

**Keywords** metaheuristics, stowage plan

## Contribution of the submission

Contribution of the submission Please outline briefly the main contribution of this submission.

## Awarding of points based on various criteria

- \* Quality of Content**  
10%

  - 10 - Excellent work and a significant contribution
  - 08 - Good work, significant
  - 06 - Solid work
  - 04 - Weak content
  - 02 - Only an insignificant contribution
  - 00 - Questionable work
  
- \* Significance for theory or practice**  
10%

  - 10 - Very significant
  - 08 - Significant
  - 06 - Not bad
  - 04 - Low significance
  - 02 - Only of marginal significance
  - 00 - Absolutely insignificant
  
- \* Originality and level of innovativeness**  
10%

  - 10 - Groundbreaking
  - 08 - A pioneer work
  - 06 - One step forward
  - 04 - Better works on the same topic exist
  - 02 - This has been said several times
  - 00 - Outdated work
  
- \* Relevance for the "Call for Papers"**  
10%

  - 10 - Appropriate to the point
  - 08 - Definitely relevant
  - 06 - Close enough
  - 04 - Not really adequate
  - 02 - Not adequate
  - 00 - Definitely unsuitable

- \* **Quality of presentation** 10%  10 - Excellently written  
 08 - Well written  
 06 - Legible  
 04 - Needs some revision  
 02 - Requires considerable work  
 00 - Not acceptable

### Decisive overall recommendation

- \* **Overall recommendation** 50%  10 - Definitely accept (very high quality)  
 09  
 08 - Probably accept (good quality)  
 07  
 06 - Lean towards acceptance (borderline quality)  
 05  
 04 - Lean towards rejection (low quality)  
 03  
 02 - Probably reject (minor quality)  
 01  
 00 - Definitely reject (has no merit)

### Comments on the submission

- \* **Comments for the authors** Please provide an as detailed as possible explanation for your evaluation, which allows the authors to understand it. Point out strengths and weaknesses of the submitted contribution. Please also provide suggestions for improvement und use an objective and constructive writing style.

### Information for the program committee

- \* **Familiarity of the reviewer with the topic**  10 - Very familiar with the topic, my area of expertise  
 08 - Good knowledge  
 06 - More or less familiar  
 04 - Only marginally familiar  
 02 - Not really familiar  
 00 - Completely new to me

**Internal comments** These comments are only for PC members and will not be passed on to authors.

