

5th ICSA in Ilmenau – Comment on the review process

Overall Process

Each submitted full-review paper will be reviewed by at least two experts in the field. Submissions will be judged on the following criteria.

Suitability: Does the contribution fit to the scope of ICSA and to the list of focus topic?

Originality: What new ideas, approaches and/or results are introduced?

Significance/contribution: Is the paper significant for audio research? What is the benefit that others can gain from the contribution?

Validity of the work: How confidently can researchers and practitioners use the results? Is the paper technically/methodologically sound? E.g. measurement setup, design of studies, conduction of simulation studies, statistical analysis, etc.

Related work: Is state-of-the-art relevant to the described work sufficiently addressed?

Completeness: Is the research carried out in a comprehensive way? Are the discussions and conclusions detailed enough?

Replicability: Are the results and conclusions clearly described and reproducible?

Presentation clarity: Is the structure of the text and the presentation of the results clear?

Each paper is managed by the Technical Program Chairs (TPCs) who are responsible for the paper. The responsibility of the TPCs is to assign reviewers to the paper which are confident with the topic. The TPCs also initiate discussions after the review submission deadline about diverging reviews and/or call in additional reviewers. If accepted papers need to be improved, the TPCs will inform the authors. If papers are not accepted the TPCs will inform the authors.

For the Reviewers

ICSA's TPCs want to ensure that the high quality of the review process is guaranteed both technically and formally. For this reason, please keep the following review guidelines in mind:

Avoid being overly negative: try to be critical yet constructive in your reviews, as any research paper has its advantages and drawbacks.

Please write a review with the quality that you would expect for your own papers. Do not submit very short, unsubstantiated reviews.

Keep a fair and open-minded approach, favoring selection of breakthrough papers that can open new areas and new research directions.

You can review a paper if the paper's topic does not fit perfectly to your expertise. Please name this circumstance in the review by rating the "familiarity" in the form and/or in the review. Judge accordingly.

Shortcomings in spelling and expression are annoying but often difficult to avoid, especially if the authors are not native speakers. Note things that are insufficient for an improvement. As long as the paper is understandable, small linguistic errors should not be a main argument for rejection.

Use the comments to the program chairs to provide confidential comments or concerns you may have.

5th ICASA in Ilmenau – Comment on the review process

Review Form

Familiarity: Your familiarity with the topic of the paper

4: Expert, 3: Familiar, 2: Some knowledge, 1: Novice

Suitability: Does the contribution fits to the scope of ICASA and in particular to spatial audio and acoustics, as well as to the focus of the conference?

4: Excellent, 3: Good, 2: Fair, 1: Poor, 0: Very poor

Significance/contribution: Is the paper significant for audio research? Is there a benefit that others can gain from the contribution?

4: Significant contribution, 3: Original work, 2: One step ahead of the pack, 1: Some scientific value, 0: Mix of well-known ideas

Presentation: Readability of the paper (organization, comprehensibility ...). Is the structure of the text and the presentation of the results clear?

4: Excellent, 3: Good, 2: Readable, 1: Poor, 0: Very poor

Related work: State of the work is sufficiently addressed.

4: Excellent, 3: Good, 2: Sufficient, 1: Poor, 0: Very poor

Reproducibility and scientific credibility: The results are clearly described and reproducible. A clear description shall include details of the methods, techniques and environment used. Reproducibility shall mean that the measurement data or methodologies can theoretically be repeated on the basis of the paper.

3: Fully, 2: Partly, 1: Insufficiently, 0: Not applicable

Recommendation: Your overall assessment of the paper

3: Definite accept, 2: Likely accept, 1: Accept if room, 0: Likely Reject, -1: Definite Reject

Remark: Extracts of this text have been adopted and adapted from the QoMEX Community (see: <https://www.qomex2019.de/reviewer-instructions/>).