

EAA Joint Symposium on Auralization and Ambisonics Berlin, 2014

Guidelines for reviewers

1 TECHNICAL GUIDELINES

1.1 Scheduling

As soon as you are notified of your assigned paper, please check all of them to make sure that

- there is no obvious conflict of interest (see Conflicts of Interest below)
- the number of assigned papers and the deadline allow you enough time to complete your reviews (see Commitment and Respect below);
- you are qualified to review the papers assigned.

If any issues arise regarding these points, notify them immediately to the Chairs. Adhering to the deadline is essential, since the authors need time to revise their paper, and the reviewers need time to check whether the revisions are accepted.

1.2 Evaluation criteria

Your evaluation of the papers assigned to you should be based upon the following criteria:

- **originality** – understood both as the exercise of independent critical thinking in defining novel problems/approaches, and as the amount of superposition with previously published material;
- **significance of the contribution to the field** – assessing the amount of material suitable for publication, and the significance of the paper in contributing to knowledge or understanding in the area with which it deals;
- **quality of research** – understood as technical correctness of the work in terms of scientific methodologies and assessment of results;
- **quality of writing** – encompassing all aspects related to quality of the literary presentation, from the overall organization of material, to usage of symbols, terms, and concepts, down to spelling, grammatical and typing errors;

Keep in mind that all contributions are already accepted for presentation at the conference. Thus, the question whether the paper meets the focus of the conference has already been decided and is no longer an issue.

Your review will, however, help to decide

- whether the paper can **appear in the fully peer-reviewed conference proceedings**
- whether it shall be **presented as a talk or a poster** and
- whether it can be recommended to appear in a special edition of Acta Acustica united with Acustica **among the best 10 papers** of the conference.

Moreover, your review will help the authors to improve their paper.

1.3 Comments for the authors

Your comments for the authors are probably the most important part of your reviews. They will be returned to the authors, so you should include any specific feedback which may help improving the papers. Thorough comments also help the Scientific Program Committee decide which papers to accept, sometimes more than your score.

Remember that your reviews are evaluated by the Scientific Program Committee. Moreover, after the completion of the review process, they will be available to other reviewers of the same papers. Therefore your good work will help generating a positive trend in the research community. Short reviews are not helpful to either the authors or the Scientific Program Committee. Please be as specific and detailed as you can. When discussing related work and references, simply saying “this is well known” or “this has been common practice for years” is not appropriate. You should cite publications, or other public disclosures of techniques, which can support your statements.

Be specific also when you suggest improvements in the writing. If there is a particular passage in the text that is unclear, point it out and give suggestions for improvements. Be generous about providing new ideas for improvement. You may suggest different techniques or tools to be used in the applications presented in a paper. You may also suggest the

authors a new application area that might benefit from their work. You may suggest them a generalization of their concept, which they have not considered.

2 ETHICAL GUIDELINES

2.1 Commitment and respect

Remember that academic careers and reputations rely on scientific publications. Therefore you have to be seriously committed to your work as a reviewer. A sketchy or casual review is a lack of respect to the authors who have seriously submitted their paper. If you have agreed to review a paper, you should devote enough time to write a thoughtful and detailed review. If you think you cannot review properly your assigned papers because you are too busy, you should not commit to your assignment.

Keep in mind that belittling or sarcastic comments are not appropriate. Even if you think that a paper is really bad, you should be constructive and still provide feedback to the authors. If you give a paper a low score, it is essential that you justify the reason for that score in detail. Also keep in mind that directly talking about the authors can be sometimes perceived as being confrontational, even though you do not mean it this way. For this reason, you may want to avoid referring to the authors by using the phrase “you” or “the authors”, and use instead “the paper”.

2.2 Confidentiality and anonymity

As a reviewer you have the responsibility to protect the confidentiality of the ideas represented in the papers you review. Submissions to the EAA Joint Symposium on Auralization and Ambisonics have not (or should not have) been published before.

In order to comply with confidentiality requirements,

- you should not show your assigned papers (or their accompanying material) to anyone else, including colleagues or students, unless you have asked them to help with your review;
- you should not use ideas from your assigned papers to develop new ones;
- after completing your reviews you should destroy all copies of your assigned papers and accompanying material, and erase any implementations you may have written and results you may have obtained to evaluate the ideas in the papers.

Although some reviewers like to disclose their identity to authors, it is advisable not to do so. One of the most common ways of inadvertently disclosing your identity is asking the authors to cite your past work and several of your own papers. This should be avoided. Besides, this attitude may have a negative effect on your review: it may be seen as if you just want to gain more citations, and may ultimately result in the authors just ignoring your review (and possibly the Scientific Program Committee too).

2.3 Conflicts of interest

Even though you would judge impartially any paper assigned to you, there has to be no doubt about the impartiality of your reviews. Therefore, if there is a potential conflict of interest with one of your assigned papers, you should inform the chairs.

Although in general you should use your judgment, examples of situations of potential conflicts of interest are the following:

- you work in the same research group as one of the authors;
- you have been involved in the work and will be credited in some way (e.g. you have hosted one of the authors in your lab, to carry out work related to the paper);
- you have formally collaborated (e.g., written a paper together, or been awarded a joint grant) with one of the authors in the past three years (more or less);
- you were the MS/PhD advisor (or advisee) of one of the authors: this is often considered to be a lifetime conflict of interest;
- you have reasons to believe that others might see a conflict of interest, even though there is none (e.g., you and one of the authors work for the same multinational corporation, although you work in different departments on different continents and have never met before).

3 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This document is partially based on the reviewers' guidelines of the CVPR2010, SIGGRAPH2008 and SMC2011 Conferences.