

## **CSCW Student Reviewing Information**

Questions can be directed to John Thomas, Student Review Mentoring Chair, CSCW 2016  
[cscw2016reviewingmentor@acm.org](mailto:cscw2016reviewingmentor@acm.org)

*Keep in mind the dual goal of this activity: It is a learning situation while also a piece of real work.*

### **CSCW reviewing process**

CSCW2016 has a revise and resubmit cycle; this means that the first set of reviews is basically to determine whether the paper should be: 1) Fast tracked, 2) Revised and resubmitted, 3) Rejected. Papers that are fast tracked will not be reviewed again by reviewers but only by PC members. Papers that are rated as “revise and resubmit” will be reviewed again by the same reviewers based upon the re-submission. This means that if you believe that the authors can solve particular shortcomings in the short period of revision, the score of the review should reflect that in the first round. However, if you do not believe the paper can be fixed in the short review cycle, the scores must reflect that. In the second review round, papers which have been revised and resubmitted are evaluated in terms of accept or reject, based upon the criteria placed by the primary AC for the paper. Thus, even though people might have done a lot in the cycle, the paper can still be rejected. Therefore it is critical that authors of papers rated “revise and resubmit” are also given concrete and direct information about what aspects need improvement.

Each paper will be read and reviewed by 2 reviewers (external to the Program committee) and 2 AC (Associate Chairs). While the secondary AC will review the paper double-blind, the first AC will make a summary and meta-review based upon all reviews and discussions and will suggest a decision. Please visit the description of the review cycle at the website <http://cscw.acm.org/2016/submit/papers.php> - here you can also find a link to examples of summary text from previous reviews as examples. Please read all the text about papers, submissions, reviews, dates etc. on the website. This also includes themes of interest for the conference etc.

CSCW does not have a required paper length. As short as possible while including all necessary information is a good guideline and typically papers are between 8-12 pages long.

### **General information about reviewing CSCW research**

1. Please write in a positive and constructive tone (think about what you would like if it were your own paper getting the feedback).
2. Be reflective while critical (include both pointing out the strengths as well as the weaknesses of the paper).
3. Start by summarizing the paper in your own words; then turn to the strengths and then the weakness - followed by a conclusion.
4. Consider the following themes in the paper and evaluate how well they are handled:
  - o The research question: Is the topic applicable to the conference and grounded in current research?

- The research method: Does the method fit with the research question? Is it well executed? Is it described in sufficient detail?
- The literature: Does the paper engage with relevant literature and cite key papers; e.g., earlier CSCW, ECSCW, JCSCW, GROUP, COOP, CHI-including relevant papers beyond the individual track papers)?
- The results and findings: Are they well-presented, interesting, new insights, applicable for the method, research question, and tradition?
- The discussion and conclusion: What are the findings? Are they interesting? Are they well argued? Are they discussed in light of former research on the topic? Is it clear what constitutes the novel contribution?

### **Where to find relevant CSCW literature:**

CSCW - ACM digital Library <http://dl.acm.org>

ECSCW - <http://www.ecscw.org>

JCSCW - <http://link.springer.com/journal/volumesAndIssues/10606>

GROUP - ACM digital Library <http://dl.acm.org>

COOP - <http://coop.wineme.fb5.uni-siegen.de>

CHI-Beyond the individual track - ACM digital Library <http://dl.acm.org>

### **Assigning student reviewers**

All student reviewers must sign-up in the PCS system - <https://precisionconference.com/~sigchi/> and fill out competences and expertise - as well as domain categories etc. They are asked to click off a selected number of areas, rather than as many as possible and keep within their knowledge arena. There is also a pdf document with a complete list of student reviewers which PC members can use.

Student reviewers are only supposed to accept one paper reviewing assignment, and cannot expect supervision on more than one paper. In addition, student reviewers should declare conflicts in conjunction with those of their supervisor; that is, they cannot accept a paper which would be in conflict with their supervisor. Conflict is determined through being in the same institution, working on a joint research project, or co-authoring publications.

We cannot guarantee that every student reviewer is actually selected to review a paper. The decision of which reviewers to pick is solely up to the PC member responsible for the paper. However, we hope that all PC members will consider using a student reviewer and that all student reviewers will be assigned a paper to review as part of this program. We will ensure that all PC members have access to the list of names.