

# Best practices in reviewing EAAE Seminar papers

Version 2, December 14, 2016

These “Best Practices” for EAAE seminar organizers contain suggestions as to how best to organize the review process of papers.

1. The best practice is that Program Committees (PC) of Seminars / Workshops / Forum write the scientific part of seminar proposal, review papers and are present at the seminar and active as session chair, discussant etc.
2. Best practices concerning the review of abstracts or papers:
  - a. Proposals for papers should be an extended abstract of 2 pages.
  - b. There should be a review process in place instigated by the PC, based on the extended abstract.
  - c. Preferably this should be a blind process, in which each paper is reviewed independently by two persons.
  - d. Reviewers should be chosen by topic and given around five papers to review, this helps in relative scoring.
  - e. Reviewers should be asked to score the paper on a 1-5 Lickert scale on at least the following points:
    - Scientific quality
    - Relevance to the seminar (and on which topic)
    - Clarity of the paper
    - Best suited for powerpoint presentation / poster presentation.
3. In addition the evaluation form should provide space for remarks on the paper for the PC-chair and suggestions to the author.
4. In deciding on acceptance it is suggested to set a minimum score for relevance and rank the papers according to scientific quality for the seminar or per topic of the seminar. A cut off point can then be decided based on the number of presentations that can be accepted, which will vary depending on the number of slots in the seminar. A division between acceptance as posters or full presentations can therefore be made in a transparent way based on the outcome of the review process.

## *Software suggestions*

5. Seminar organizers can handle the papers without the support of specific conference software. In these cases they usually work with a spreadsheet or small database that is built for the occasion. Participants send their paper to a central email address and receive feedback via email. Reviewers from the program committee are also sent papers by email and they send a standard form back.
6. Sometimes a university or institute has an in-house PCO (professional congress organizing company), or involves a commercial PCO. However, the cost of such a facility can be substantial as can be their software. An internet search (conducted in 2009) found that several software solutions are available:
  - [www.conftool.net](http://www.conftool.net) a German company that provides a package, cheap for small non commercial events.
  - [www.conference.com](http://www.conference.com)
  - [www.lombego.de](http://www.lombego.de) another German company from Weimar, that offers a package Lance.
  - [www.admire.be](http://www.admire.be) this is a PCO from Leuven, Belgium.
  - [www.cos.com](http://www.cos.com) is the Community of Science that provides an abstract management system.

The content of the services of these packages is not very clear and can differ substantially between the packages. Reviewing is done quite differently between different science disciplines, and therefore the use of a standard package can conflict with the evaluation method the program committee has in mind. It should be noted that the EAAE does not endorse any specific software and the list above is given just for information and it is up to the organiser to select the software that best matches their needs.