

Review Criteria

The AI Reviewers will use the following checklist for reviewing your conference paper. The checklist is based on the CASP checklist for qualitative research.

CASP grew out of the work of the critical appraisal Skills Programme in Oxford, (known as CASP UK). This work began in 1993 to help health care decisions makers understand scientific evidence. To assess the trustworthiness, relevance and results of scientific papers, CASP offers series of [checklist](#). For this conference we have adapted their checklist for qualitative research.

Depending on how your project looks like, not all criteria may apply. The AI Reviewers will also have an option: does not apply. All criteria that do apply will be evaluated on a scale 1 to 10.

Section A: Study Design

- 1. Was there a clear statement of the aims of the research?**
 - what was the goal of the research?
 - why was it thought important?
 - Is it relevant?
- 2. Is a qualitative methodology appropriate?**
 - Is qualitative research the right methodology for addressing the research goal?
- 3. Was the research design appropriate to address the aims of the research? This includes recruitment and data collection strategy.**
 - Is the research design justified (e.g., have they discussed how they decided which method to use)?
 - Is it explained how and why the participants were selected?
 - Is it clear how data were collected (e.g. focus group, semi-structured interview etc.)
 - Is the methods of data collection justified in the article?
 - Has the methods been made explicit (e.g. for interview method, is there an indication of how interviews are conducted, or did they use a topic guide)?

- Is the form of data clear (e.g. tape recordings, video material, notes etc.)?

4. Has the relationship between researcher and participants been adequately considered?

- Is there a critical examination of the role of the human and if applicable AI researcher, potential bias and influence during (a) formulation of the research questions (b) data collection, including sample recruitment and choice of location

Section B: Results

5. Was the data analysis sufficiently rigorous?

- Is there is an in-depth description of the analysis process?
- Are sufficient data presented to support the findings?
- To what extent are contradictory data taken into account?
- Is there a critically examination of the role of the researcher (AI or human), potential bias and influence during analysis and selection of data for presentation?

6. Is there a clear statement of findings?

- Are the findings explicit?
- Are the credibility of the findings discussed (e.g. triangulation, respondent validation, more than one analyst)?
- Are the findings discussed in relation to the original research question?

7. How valuable is the research?

- Does the researcher discuss the contribution the study makes to existing knowledge or understanding?

Section C: Ethics

8. Have ethical issues been taken into consideration?

- Are there sufficient details of how the research was explained to participants for the reader to assess whether ethical standards were maintained, if applicable.
- Have issues raised by the study been discussed (e.g. issues around informed

consent or confidentiality or how they have handled the effects of the study on the participants during and after the study)

9. How well does the human researcher reflect the use of AI in this article

- Does the paper clearly state which AI tools or models were used and at which points in the process?
- Is it clear how the AI was used, including the role of the researcher and how tasks were shared between human and AI?
- Is there a reflection on how AI integration affected the research process?
- Does the researcher discuss any surprises or unintended effects, positive or negative?
- Did the researcher consider whether AI influenced the interpretation of the data or the voice of participants?
- How critically does the researcher assess the strengths and weaknesses of using AI in their study?