

# Instructions for Reviewers

## 1. Summary of upcoming deadlines (Anywhere on Earth (AoE))

June 3, 2026	Paper allocation
June 29, 2026	Reviews Due
June 29 - July 3, 2026	Discussion
July 7, 2026	Authors Notification
July 7 - July 23, 2026	Shepherding/Revision
July 28, 2026	Shepherding/Revision Authors Notification
August 3, 2026	Camera ready

**Note:** *We do not have a revise-and-resubmit option this year. Papers will either be accepted as is, or those requiring minor revisions, doable in 2 weeks, will be moved to the shepherding phase.*

## 2. Guidelines for Reviewing

We have also prepared the following guidelines, which may be helpful in reviewing the papers:

### 2.1 Positive and constructive approach:

*Please treat the papers as if they were your own!*

Please take a constructive approach and envision ways to improve the paper rather than just criticizing it. When giving feedback, the focus should be on the work, not the authors, e.g., “the paper should standardize the presentation of the statistical outcomes” rather than “the authors badly present their statistical findings poorly”.

Please maintain a cordial tone; this may be the first submission of a young researcher, a PhD student who will take your feedback very personally.

Please consider the following aspects in your comments:

- **Scope:** Is the paper appropriate for the scope of this conference?

Please take into account that the paper should address both technical and human components of the sociotechnical system.

- **Novelty:** Is this original material distinct from previous publications?

We are accepting the replication papers, but from the material provided, it should be very clear why the replication is necessary and how it improves the state of the art in the field.

- **Methodology:** Is the study well-designed and executed?

Please take into account that as the conference is multidisciplinary, disciplines could significantly differ from the level of details and structure of the methodological section of the paper, and take a comprehensive approach while still pointing to inconsistencies and lacunae.

- **Clarity:** Are the ideas expressed clearly, concisely, and logically?

Please take into account that English is not necessarily the authors' first language, and do not comment on language unless the situation is extreme.

- **Advancement:** Is this a significant contribution to the field?

Note: Novelty is not always easy to assess, so do not base your decision only on this criterion.

In addition to the above, we request that you pay **special attention to ethical and publication requirements, including ensuring that no questionable ethical issues are involved in the research.**

If you identify a flaw in the paper, please assess whether it can be addressed through *shepherding*. In the confidential comments to PC chairs, please also mark if you would like to volunteer to shepherd the paper. If there are no volunteers for shepherding, the PC Chairs will assign one of the reviewers to take this responsibility.

## 2.2 Reviewer's Form

In the Easy Chair , the reviewer will be asked to pick one of the options, described in the table below, and provide detailed comments.

**Overall evaluation.** \* Please provide a detailed review, including a justification for your scores. Both the score and the review text are required.

- strong accept
- accept
- weak accept
- borderline paper
- weak reject
- reject
- strong reject

---

**Reviewer's confidence.** \*

- (expert)
- (high)
- (medium)
- (low)
- (none)

---

**Confidential remarks for the program committee.** If you wish to add any remarks intended only for PC members please write them below. These remarks will only be seen by the PC members having access to reviews for this submission. They will not be sent to the authors. This field is optional.

## 2.3 Timeliness

We are very pressed for time, as the preparation period for our conference coincides with the summer student evaluation season and summer break, so we would highly appreciate the timely reviews! Please contact the PC chairs ASAP if you encounter any obstacles that can delay the submission review.

## 2.4 Confidentiality and use of AI

All submissions must be treated as confidential. You are not expected to share any papers assigned to you. If you have any concerns or questions regarding the use of external reviewers (e.g., if you need additional expertise to assess a particular part of the paper), please reach out to the PC chairs directly.

We are not allowing the use of AI at any stage of the review process, as it conflicts with the principle of confidentiality. If you are using spell-checker tools, which may be considered as AI tools (e.g Grammarly) please mention it in the confidential comment to PC.

## 2.5 Anonymization

If a paper explicitly deanonymizes the authors, please inform us immediately, as this violates submission guidelines and the paper will be rejected. We have already checked on this, so we hope it will not be the case.

As our rules do not forbid posting preprints of articles, deanonymized versions of articles may be found on external sources like arXiv. However, **we kindly ask that you not deliberately search for these preprints or bring information about them into the discussion.** If you feel that your prior knowledge of an earlier version of the paper creates a conflict of interest for reviewing it, please contact the PC chairs.

## 3. External Guiding Policies

Please be sure that you are acting in line with:

<https://conferences.ieeeauthorcenter.ieee.org/understand-peer-review/ethics-in-peer-review/>

And

<https://journals.ieeeauthorcenter.ieee.org/become-an-ieee-journal-author/publishing-ethics/guidelines-and-policies/submission-and-peer-review-policies/>