

Subject: Reviewer Guidelines

As a paper reviewer you are playing a critical role in the review process and fulfilling an important obligation of a committee member, The care and thoroughness of your review are the foundations for the quality of a good review requires fairness in judgment, expertise in the field, and carefully crafted comments that help authors improve their papers and work. Please take the time the following instructions.

1. About Review Comments.

The paper review process has two separate but equally important goals. The first is to provide guidance to the authors, and the second is to provide editor and conference organizer with the basis for presentation and publication decisions. Paper reviewers have a responsibility to read the paper carefully and then provide the authors with a clear, detailed, diplomatic, and unbiased evaluation. Avoid vague complaints and provide appropriate citations if authors are unaware of relevant work. Reviewers often begin with an overall assessment of the paper and continue by identifying the prominent strengths and weaknesses. Starting with the “big picture” helps the author frame the subsequent detailed comments. The detailed comments should focus on specific features of the paper Review Form we sent you. Please notice that: You are required to notify the conference staff immediately if unable to review in a timely manner and providing the names of potential other reviewers

The process and peer reviewers must be diligent about their adherence to all procedures, follow all criteria carefully, and conduct themselves in a professional, equitable way with integrity.

2. Confidentiality.

The contents of the papers cannot be used, referenced, or included in future work by the reviewers until the review, presentation, and publication processes are complete. Until then, the information in the papers should be treated as confidential and may not be used for any purpose not related to the review process. Reviewers should never share the reviewed version of the paper, review findings, reviewer comments on papers, or deliberations on the review decisions with anyone other than the review committee and the conference staff.

3. Conflicts

A conflict of interest is defined as a situation in which the reviewer can be viewed as being able to benefit personally from the outcome of a review, or in which the reviewer is not able to remain objective for personal reasons. If a conflict of interest exists, then the reviewer should decline to review a paper.

If a reviewer feels unable to render an objective judgment for any reason, he or she should notify the conference staff.

We hope you find your job fun and rewarding. These rules guidelines are based on the experience of past conference, but they cannot hope to cover every possible question that you may have. If you desire modifications be made from these guidelines, You are encouraged to seek out the advice of the Board. We are all interested in furthering the goals of the Association, and you should feel free to Contact us.

Sincerely,

Carrie K. Tsui



Conference Director of IASED

