

CSCW Student Reviewing Information

Questions can be directed to John Thomas, Student Review Mentoring Chair, CSCW 2016
cscw2016reviewingmentor@acm.org

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

CSCW reviewing process

CSCW2016 has a revise and resubmit cycle, which mean that the first set of reviews is basically to determine whether the paper should 1) Fast tracked, 2) Revised and resubmit, 3) Rejected. Papers that are fast tracked will not be reviewed again by reviewers but only by PC members. Papers that are 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 revisions, 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 papers with 'revise and resubmit' are concrete and direct in what aspects which needs work, to provide the authors with the best opportunity to improve their paper.

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-blinded 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 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 paper length, as short as possible is maybe the guideline and typically papers are between 8-12 pages in the template.

General information about reviewing CSCW research

1. Please write in a positive and constructive tone (think about if it was your own paper getting the feedback)
2. Be reflective while critical (what is the strength as well as the weakness 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 it is done:
 - The research question (applicable for the conference, grounded in current research etc.),

- The research method (does it fit with the research question, is it well done, do you need more information etc. applicable to the aim etc.),
- The literature (does the paper engage with relevant literature, cite key papers - earlier CSCW, ECSCW, JCSCW, GROUP, COOP, CHI-Beyond the individual track etc. papers)
- The results and findings (well-presented, interesting, new insights, applicable for the method, research question, and tradition)
- The discussion and conclusion (what are the findings, how are they interesting, how are they well argued, discussed accordantly to former research on the topic, what is 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, rather than as many as possible and keeping within their knowledge arena. Also there is a pdf document with a complete list of student reviewers, which PC members can use.

Student reviewers are only supposed to accept reviewing one paper, and cannot expect supervision on more than one paper. In addition, student reviewers should declare conflict together with their supervisor, which mean that they cannot accept papers which is in conflict with their supervisor. Conflict is determined through same institution, joint research project, and publications.

We cannot guarantee that student reviewers are selected for reviewing of papers. The decision of which reviewers to pick is solo up to the PC member responsible for the paper. However, we hope that all student reviewers will be assigned a paper to review as part of this program and will ensure that all PC members know about the list of names.