

Dear Reviewer,

We are grateful for your willingness to serve as a reviewer for WASPAA 2023. Your role is pivotal in ensuring the quality and success of the workshop.

**What happens next?** Update your information for the Toronto Paper Matching System (TPMS). Also, in your CMT profile, add conflict domains and set your maximum review quota between 4 and 6 (we strongly encourage you to keep the default value of 6). Shortly after the first submission deadline you will be asked to bid for papers and identify specific conflicts of interest. Based on this information you will be assigned paper submissions for review. As a reviewer for those papers you will have 3 main responsibilities: (1) to identify potential COIs or other desk issues upon assignment; (2) to complete a thorough review for each assigned paper; and (3) to actively participate in the discussion phase and change your reviews based on the authors' rebuttal accordingly. Below we outline some guidelines to assist you in this process.

**Upon Review Assignment:**

- Do an initial scan of your assigned papers as soon as you receive them. Identify potential conflicts of interest, disclosure of authors' identities, and other issues needing quick clarification from authors, meta-reviewers or the TPC chairs.
- Note that the review process is *double-blind* this year. We are asking authors not to identify themselves and their institutions in the paper, but acknowledge that they may decide to post their papers on arXiv, while we still discourage advertising the work on social media until accepted. Therefore, don't go out of your way to identify the authors, and if by any chance you are able to do so, try your best not to let that knowledge affect the outcome of the review process. If inadvertently identifying the authors leads to a potential conflict of interest, let the meta-reviewer and TPC chairs know immediately.

**For your Review:**

- Provide substantial, constructive and timely feedback. Write as if you were addressing a close colleague or friend. Write directly, thoughtfully and politely.
- For individual questions in the review form, provide short, written justification of your recommended scores. Individual reviewers interpret the rating scale differently, so a written justification helps the authors, meta-reviewers and TPC chairs to understand your rating better.
- The section with comments for the authors is the most important in the form. We expect a substantial review with multiple paragraphs and itemized lists and recommend the following structure: (1) a 1-paragraph summary of the paper identifying core contribution(s), main strengths and weaknesses; (2) a detailed account of both major and minor issues with the paper, with a clear description and rationale for each criticism. Use citations as needed. Each major issue needs to be described in sufficient detail for the authors to be able to respond and/or revise the paper accordingly.
- Provide definitive accept/reject recommendations in your review scores, and avoid marginal recommendations as much as possible. Your score should be consistent with your assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of the paper. Accepts imply that any issues can be addressed in the camera-ready version, while rejects imply that there are major issues that cannot reasonably be expected to be addressed by the end of the review process. Papers should not be rejected for minor issues.
- If no or minimal justification is provided, or if the review is deemed to be of insufficient quality, the meta-reviewer or TPC chairs might request that you revise your review. Help us ensure the quality of WASPAA and help researchers in the field understand how to strengthen their work.
- If you encounter an exceptional paper, we encourage you to nominate the paper for an award and provide a brief rationale. Your nomination won't be visible to the authors.
- Complete the review process within the specified time, so that the rebuttal, discussion and decisions can be completed without delays.

**Rebuttal and discussion:**

- Authors have the option of writing a rebuttal letter prior to the discussion period. The purpose of the rebuttal is to address issues raised in the reviews and propose revisions if the paper is accepted. Keep in mind that, if accepted, only *minor revisions* are typically allowed for the camera-ready version of the paper. Any suggestion of a major revision in the rebuttal should be backed by evidence and only considered in special circumstances.
- At the start of the discussion phase, we expect reviewers to read the rebuttal letter and the other reviews.
- The discussion will be led by the meta-reviewer for each paper. Please plan to actively participate in all discussions, engaging early and meaningfully. Expect to commit 1-2 hours during the discussion phase across all your papers.
- Be respectful of other reviewers' views, but do not hesitate to try to persuade others if you have a strong opinion. Whenever possible, try to form a consensus towards a final recommendation for each paper.
- If the rebuttal/discussion changes your mind, update both your scores and commentary accordingly, and please acknowledge the rebuttal letter.

Thank you once again for your invaluable service as a reviewer. If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact us. We truly appreciate your contribution and look forward to working with you.

Timeline	Action Item
4/21	Abstract/title deadline (for authors)
4/24-5/3	Paper bidding (for reviewers / meta-reviewers)
4/28	Full paper deadline (for authors)
5/5	Meta-reviewer assignments complete (for TPC chairs)
5/12	Reviewer assignments complete (for meta-reviewers)
6/2	Review deadline (for reviewers)
6/12	Reviews released to the authors
6/23	Rebuttal deadline (for authors)
7/4	Discussion period ends (reviewers / meta-reviewers)
7/7	Meta-reviews deadline (meta reviewers)
7/12	Final notifications (TPC chairs)

Warm regards,  
WASPAA 2023 Organizers

\*\*\*\*\*Original guidelines by Minje and Nick

Dear Reviewer,

We are delighted that you have agreed to serve as a reviewer for WASPAA 2023. Your contribution is pivotal in ensuring the quality and integrity of the selection process. We have outlined an overview of our review process this year as well as general guidelines below to help you carry out your duties effectively and efficiently.

## Overview

- The review process is double-blind, and we request that you maintain anonymity throughout the process.
- Each reviewer is assigned up to their set maximum quota (default six). We recommend reviewing no more than six papers for the maximum review quality.
- The authors will provide a rebuttal after the reviews are released, and we kindly request that you read it and adjust your opinion accordingly.
- Please participate in the discussion led by the meta-reviewer.
- Meta-reviewers provide their own full reviews along with reviewers.
- Reviewer and meta-review re-rating is strongly encouraged.

## Guidelines

### Before Paper Assignment

- Before paper assignment, update your conflicts of interest (COI). Identify conflicting institutions, research groups, and/or individuals that would yield a conflict of interest.
- Update your Google Scholar URL which can help out the paper assignment process.
- Update your Toronto Paper Matching System's profile as well.
- Set the maximum quota of papers you are willing to review. We recommend 4-6 papers to ensure you see a variety of submissions, but not have too much work.
- Bidding or not?

### Upon review assignments

- Notify your meta-reviewer of any COI immediately.
- Verify there is no identifying author information with the submitted papers. Authors are allowed to submit their work to arXiv, but not allowed to identify themselves in their submitted manuscript to WASPAA. Advertisement on social media is also discouraged.
- If you identify the authors of a paper during your review, please report it to your meta-reviewer immediately and request to review an alternative paper. Requests will only be considered if meta-reviewers are notified early within the review process. If your report is too late, finding a replacement can be tricky, and the review process will be delayed. So please be vigilant on this issue.

### Review guidelines:

- We request that you provide constructive feedback while reviewing the assigned paper and that you do so in a timely manner.
- Write your review as if you were addressing a close colleague or friend. Write directly, thoughtfully and politely.

- Recommended review structure (comments to the authors section):
  - Write a short 1-3 summary of the paper and try to identify the core contribution(s).
  - Identify both strengths and weaknesses for each paper under review.
  - In your detailed review, try to identify issues as minor vs. major. A paper should not be rejected for minor, addressable issues. Major issues should be clearly explainable. Citing a missing minor reference can typically be easily addressed, but redoing one or more experiments with additional missing baseline methods typically cannot.
- On the individual questions, provide written justification of your recommended scores. Individual reviewers will internalize the rating scale differently, so a written justification is required.
  - If no or minimal justification is provided, the meta-reviewer or TCPs will request that you revise your review. Please help us ensure the quality of WASPAA and help researchers in the field understand how to strengthen their work.

#### **Author Rebuttal:**

- Authors have an option to write a rebuttal.
- The purpose of the rebuttal is to clarify any misunderstandings from the reviews, offer minor updates, and in some cases, consider additional information.
- Major updates, such as those common in journal paper reviews, must only be allowed if they are feasible with supporting evidence. A mere promise for a major update by the authors should not be disregarded.
- We require that you read and acknowledge the author's rebuttal.
- If the rebuttal changes your mind, please update your scores and commentary accordingly.

#### **Discussion:**

- The discussion will be led by the paper meta-reviewer.
- Please participate in required discussions with other reviewers and the meta-reviewer. Engage early and meaningfully.
- Please expect to commit 1-2 hours or more during the discussion phase, especially if you are reviewing multiple papers.
- Please respect other reviewers' views, but if you have a strong opinion, we encourage you to try to persuade other reviewers.
- If the discussion changes your mind, update both your scores and commentary accordingly.
- Please try to form a consensus on the final accept or reject score on each paper.
- If you have confirmed a score change in the discussion, propagate the update to your individual review commentary and scores to reflect the change.

#### **Award Recommendations:**

- If you encounter an exceptional paper (i.e., the top 10% of the entire WASPAA papers), we kindly request that you recommend the paper for an award with a justification.

Thank you for your invaluable contribution to our conference. If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact us. We look forward to working with you.

Warm regards,  
WASPAA 2023 Organizers