

# Guidelines for Abstract Review (CIE 2021)

## Information and discussion

(Status 2021-04-07, after submission deadline)

- There are total 141 abstracts submitted (from 32 countries).
- 22 among them requested to be poster. We will follow this.
- 119 requested to be oral.
- One or two (or zero) contributed papers can be presented in each seminar/workshop if the convenor wishes so. The list of papers will be sent to all seminar/workshop conveners who will be asked to check the list in terms of suitability for their seminar/workshop. If some oral papers are selected for presentation in a seminar/workshop, the number for oral presentations will increase. This must be decided by end of July.
- The abstract review will take place offline. You receive a PDF file containing all abstracts with an Excel file listing the abstracts assigned to you (maximum 15). The review will be double-blind, i.e. you will not see the name(s) of authors and the authors will not see who reviewed their abstract.
- Each abstract is assigned to two reviewers at least. The other reviewers of the abstracts you review will not be revealed to you. If the scores of two reviewers differ much, we may assign a third reviewer.

## Instructions

- You will receive your list of abstracts to review shortly after the submission deadline, by **April 8**.
- First, quickly check the abstracts assigned to you, and inform Jennifer Veitch and Peter Zwick by **April 13** at the latest if you think you are not the right person to review an abstract assigned to you (technically or conflict of interest). Then we will re-assign such abstracts to other reviewers.
- In the Excel list provided for you, you may add comments to each abstract in the respective columns: A “confidential” one, which later on will only be shared among the ISC members, and another one (“comments for author”) meant for the author him/herself. Please write “comments for author” if you find any errors or inappropriate descriptions (e.g. commercial product name or brand name). We will send these comments to the authors later asking them to consider when writing their paper for the proceedings.
- The abstracts have to be rated according to the guidelines below. Please write one or two sentences (as confidential comments) to indicate the reason for your rating.
- All accepted abstracts will be published in an abstract booklet to be distributed to all participants at the conference. That is why corrections, if necessary, should be made.
- Finally you need to give a score (1 to 5) on each abstract in the Excel file. Please use the following
  - 1 definitely oral
  - 2 probably good for oral
  - 3 should be presented poster
  - 4 should be poster (select 4 or 5 for abstracts submitted explicitly for poster presentation)
  - 5 should be rejected
- The abstract will show in the header if the author submitted it explicitly for poster presentation. If so, it should not be selected for oral presentation or presented poster. It needs to be reviewed only for acceptance (4) or rejection (5).

- Please consider the following for your judgement:

Check

- the relevance of the subject to this conference;
- whether the contents of the abstract is really substantial;
- whether the abstract is written in proper English - if not, it might be reasonable to suggest that the paper should preferably become a poster (in case all other criteria for a recommended presentation are met).

Think about

- whether the work seems to be done well from a scientific standpoint;
  - whether it will add something valuable to our understanding;
  - whether you would want to sit to listen to an oral presentation on it (given that there is limited time for oral presentations and they should be topics that lots of people will want to hear);
  - whether it is better suited to a poster presentation where there is more time to talk to the author (especially if the topic is one that will be of interest to a relatively small number of people).
- Please submit your review results to [peter.zwick@cie.co.at](mailto:peter.zwick@cie.co.at) not later than **May 2, 2021**. In case of any questions, please contact Jennifer Veitch and Peter Zwick.

**Check List**

currently relevant topic	
contents of the abstract substantial	
abstract written in proper English	
work seems to be done well from a scientific standpoint	
will add something valuable to our understanding	
would want to sit to listen to an oral presentation on it	
better suited to a poster presentation where there is more time to talk to the author	