

## Published Rules for ICIDS review process – revised February 2021

These rules are provided by ARDIN to help guide the Organizing Committee (General Chairs and Program Chairs) of a given year's conference in the running of the technical program.

### *Review committee*

1. The reviewing committee consists of 2 Program Chairs (PCs), Area Chairs (ACs) invited by the PCs to oversee specific areas (at least 2 per topic area), and a Program Committee of invited reviewers.
2. Program Chairs and Area Chairs invite reviewers based on previous lists plus feedback from previous organizers.
3. All reviewers, including chairs, are required to declare conflicts of interest. One reason for dual chairs is that chairs can submit work, too, but then the reviewing process for that work will be headed by the other chair.
4. The paper review process is double-blind, where "paper" refers to long papers, full papers, and posters (including demos). ICIDS follows the CHI anonymization policy: <https://chi2021.acm.org/for-authors/presenting/papers/chi-anonymization-policy>.
5. After the submission deadline has passed, the PCs may open a bidding process to facilitate assigning papers to reviewers. Based on the bidding results, the PCs and ACs will assign reviewers to papers.
6. Reviewers are made aware that their performance may be evaluated.

### *Review process:*

7. ACs will check for papers that have not been anonymized, do not meet the paper length limits, or do not fit the scope of the conference, for possible desk rejection.
8. In the case of non-anonymized papers, authors should be asked to anonymize and resubmit immediately.
9. The PCs will make the desk reject decisions. Any papers that are desk rejected **must receive a review** by an AC explaining the reason for rejection.
10. Each paper will receive a **minimum of three reviews**, plus a **meta review** provided by an AC. The purpose of the meta review is to synthesize the other three reviews.
11. Each reviewer assesses each paper on a scale established by the PCs. They also provide written feedback. The AC will monitor reviews and provide feedback to reviewers if the written feedback is lacking in sufficient detail or does not maintain a professional tone. The AC should encourage discussion among reviewers.
12. The AC or the PCs will solicit additional reviews in ambiguous cases.
13. The process includes a rebuttal phase. Preliminary reviews, including the preliminary meta-review, will be sent to authors, without an indication of a final decision, and authors will be invited to submit a rebuttal. Authors may use the rebuttal to clarify their points, and propose improvements.
14. Rebuttals are to be read by the reviewers and the AC, and changes, if any, made to the reviews. Further discussion among the AC and reviewers is encouraged. Reviewers and ACs are to indicate in their review that they have read the rebuttal, even if no changes are made.
15. A virtual Program Committee meeting (PC meeting) will be held, attended by the PCs and the ACs.
16. Prior to the PC meeting, papers above a threshold will be marked as "Tentative Accept", and those below a threshold marked as "Reject". During the PC meeting, ACs will briefly summarize their position on undecided papers: Accept, Reject, or Reject (Re-categorize), and a non-binding recommendation will be made.
17. Following the PC meeting, the PCs will make the final decisions. Results may be Tentatively Accepted, Rejected (Re-categorize) or Rejected.
18. Rejected (Re-categorize) papers may be considered for acceptance in another category at the discretion of the PCs, in consultation with the AC. The normal process is that Long Papers can become Short Papers and Short Papers can become Posters; however, Long Papers becoming Posters is also a possibility.

19. The results of the review process are communicated to the authors, and authors are to submit their final papers by the camera-ready deadline.
20. Re-categorized papers will be given an earlier camera-ready deadline to allow time for checking of the revised paper.
21. After the camera-ready date, ACs will check their papers to ensure that any necessary changes were made, and that formatting and length requirements are met. In particular, for Re-categorized papers, ACs must check that the revised paper is acceptable and highlight any issues to the PCs. Papers may need to be sent back to authors for minor revisions, or possibly rejected at this point, although rejection is discouraged. Any decision to reject at this point will be made by the PCs.
22. An Ombudsperson (appointed by ARDIN) exists, who can be contacted by submission authors and who can (together with the ARDIN executive board) overrule decisions and mediate in case of issues. This process is only available if all other procedures have been exhausted and is thus understood to be reserved for emergencies only.
23. The Ombudsperson is there to investigate cases in which the published rules of the review process have not been followed. They will not respond to complaints about review results if proper procedures have been followed.