**EAD2019 Reviewer Advice and Guidelines**

**Extended Abstracts and Full Papers**

Thank you for being a Reviewer for EAD2019, the conference could not happen without you!

The following guide and checklist have been created as a way to offer support to you in the reviewing process. It borrows from the CHI and DIS Guides to Reviewing Papers (<https://chi2018.acm.org/guide-to-reviewing-papers/> and <http://dis2018.org/pdf/DIS2018GuideforReviewingPapers.pdf>).

EAD aims to create a collegiate, nurturing environment where PhD, early career and experienced design researchers can feel free to share and test their work and ideas. We encourage all reviewers to give constructive feedback, using positive and clear language, ensuring that final submissions offer the highest standards of quality and rigour.

**Review Process**

Within each Track for the Conference there is a Track Chair or Chairs and one or several Co-Chairs. There is then a group of invited Reviewers whose expertise relates directly to the Track Theme. To review submissions to the conference, you will be required to use the online system ConfTool. You will either be sent your log in details via email, or asked to sign up using the online form: <https://www.conftool.org/ead2019/>

When the Extended Abstracts are submitted and the deadline has closed, you will be allocated papers from a specific Track based on your areas of expertise. On the ConfTool system you will be asked to state any conflicts of interest you may have so that these abstracts can be allocated elsewhere. There are two reviewers assigned to each abstract, in a double-blind review process, with any disagreements resolved and final decisions on acceptance falling to Track Chairs. The same process will be used for the full paper submissions.

**Evaluation Criteria**

The 6 criteria outlined below are to be used for evaluating the submissions via the ConfTool system. Each is marked out of 10, with 10 being the highest score. Each of the first five is worth 10%, with the overall recommendation worth 50% of the score.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **% of paper score (1-10 – 10 being the highest)** |
| Significance of Contribution (theoretical, methodological or practice) | 10% |
| Originality of Contribution (theoretical, methodological or practice) | 10% |
| Quality and Standards of Scholarship (e.g. relevant literature review, referencing, description and appropriateness of methodology etc.) | 10% |
| Relevance to Conference and Track Themes | 10% |
| Clarity of presentation (e.g. structure of paper and argument, relevance and number of images etc.) | 10% |
| Overall recommendation | 50% |

**Suggested Outline for Comments**

The ConfTool online review form will give the following suggested outline for your review:

* Summarise the paper and state its main contribution: this supports Chairs in finalising reviews and shows authors their paper has been understood.
* Is the paper relevant to the conference theme, and track?
* What are the strengths? What are the weaknesses? Comment on e.g. standards of scholarship, referencing, methodological issues, presentation, quality of images etc. (as appropriate for either abstract or full paper formats).
* How might the paper be improved? Offer specific and constructive suggestions.
* Your role is not as proof reader, but please note any minor corrections required.

It also offers a box for Internal Comments and other information. These comments will not be passed on to Authors. You will also have the chance to nominate papers for the Best Paper Award or suggest whether they do not meet the standards expected of a paper and should be resubmitted as posters instead.

**Reviewing Tips for Extended Abstracts and Papers**

* As a rough guide, please allow around 20-30 minutes to review Extended Abstracts, and up to one hour for Full Papers.
* As a starting point for considering acceptance, begin with the contribution: if the abstract or paper makes a solid contribution backed up with good scholarship it should be accepted, even if there are some issues with presentation. If the contribution is small, but the paper is otherwise excellent, it should still be accepted, as this is still a sign of quality research.
* Papers by PhD students are submitted within the main conference and Authors can identify themselves as such. Please take this into account in your review process, offering additional feedback if required. EAD wants to nurture the next generation of design researchers, and delivering papers amongst more experienced academics provides an excellent opportunity to learn and raise standards.
* If the abstract/paper does not fit within the Track, consider whether it may be more suited to another Track and make this recommendation to your Track Chair.
* If there appears to be insufficient depth to be considered for a full paper, then consider whether it could be re-submitted as a poster and state this on the online form.
* In terms of the length of reviews: consider your own experience as an author - what level of feedback would you find helpful for your own work? It should be manageable for you as Reviewer, and supporting and encouraging for the Author. Too short and this may be frustrating and unhelpful for improvement: too long and it becomes unwieldy for all concerned. As a rough guide, Extended Abstract reviews should be at least 100-200 words, with Full Paper reviews at least 300-400 words.

**Checklist for Reviewing Extended Abstracts and Papers**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Y | N | N/A |
| Is the title appropriate?  |  |  |  |
| Is the literature review relevant, adequate, and up to date?  |  |  |  |
| Are full references provided? |  |  |  |
| Have research ethics been addressed appropriately? |  |  |  |
| If images/figures/tables are used, are they clear and relevant? |  |  |  |
| Is the methodology well described? |  |  |  |
| Have the outcomes/findings been communicated clearly and are they evidenced sufficiently? |  |  |  |
| Are any limitations noted and discussed? |  |  |  |
| **Does this paper make a new or substantial contribution to theory, methodology or practice?** |  |  |  |