

Submissions	Reviews	Status	Assignment	PC	Events	Email	Administration	STPIS'18	Premium	CFP	News	Alerts	EasyChair
-------------	---------	--------	------------	----	--------	-------	----------------	----------	---------	-----	------	--------	-----------

Review Form

[Add field](#)
[Reorder fields](#)

The table showing the structure of the review form, and the review form itself, are shown below. To **edit** or **delete** a field click on the images  and .

To **add a field** or **reorder fields** use the menu in the upper right corner.

Review Form Summary

Title	Help text	Kind	has text	text required	text visible to authors	weight	has scores	score required	score visible to authors	Scores	edit	delete
Relevance	Assess the relevance of the paper to the goals and topics at http://stpisp2017.blogs.dsv.su.se/goal-topics/ . If possible point out the topic number from this page when writing your comments. if implicitly relevant, suggest how to make it explicitly relevant	text/score	✓	✓	✓	0	✓	✓	✓	Not relevant; Implicitly relevant; Explicitly relevant		
Categorization	If you do not agree with the paper categorization by the authors, you can reclassify it. For instance, if an experience report does not follow the guidelines, you might want to reclassify it as a research or idea paper. Explain you decision to reclassify. If possible give recommendations on what needs to be done to better adjust to the new category	text/score	✓	✓	✓	0	✓	✓	✓	Poster; Research paper; Experience report; Position paper; Idea paper; Multimedia; The category is correct		
Originality	Assess originality of: ideas and results and presence of partial evaluation (FULL RESEARCH); interesting observations and lessons (EXPERIENCE REPORT); vision (IDEA); interesting question or position (POSITION); exciting presentation (MULTI-MEDIA)	text/score	✓	✓	✓	0	✓	✓	✓	Nothing new or interesting; ; Some new or interesting material; Substantial amount of new or very interesting material		
Discussability	Rate the potential of the paper for raising useful and interesting discussion.	text/score	✓	✓	✓	0	✓	✓	✓	Low; Medium; High		
Style	Is the style of the paper follows the recommendation given at http://stpisp2018.blogs.dsv.su.se/submission/ and guidelines given at http://stpisp2018.blogs.dsv.su.se/guidelines/ . If possible, give recommendations on improvement	text/score	✓	✓	✓	0	✓	✓	✓	No; Partly; Yes		
Language	Evaluate the quality of the language used in, and the presentation of the paper. Give suggestions for improvement.	text/score	✓	✓	✓	0	✓	✓	✓	Unacceptable; Acceptable; Good		
Practicality discussed?	Asses whether the paper discusses practical application of its results/suggestions. Desirable for all types of submissions, but especially for idea papers and research papers. Experience report should have it by default as this is part of lessons learned.	text/score	✓	✓	✓	0	✓	✓	✓	No; To some extent; Yes		
Practical usefulness	Asses practical usefulness of the results. Identify areas were it could be useful	text/score	✓	✓	✓	0	✓	✓	✓	Not useful; Could be useful; Definitely useful		
Overall evaluation	Scores required	text/score				1	✓	✓	✓	strong reject; reject; weak reject; borderline paper; weak accept; accept; strong accept		

Title	Help text	Kind	has text	text required	text visible to authors	weight	has scores	score required	score visible to authors	Scores	edit	delete
Reviewer's confidence		reviewer confidence					✓	✓		(none); (low); (medium); (high); (expert)		
Justification and additional comments to the authors	Please, provide justification for your decision, if the decision is not clear from the detailed scores and comments to them. Provide recommendation to the authors on how to improve the paper.	text/score	✓	✓	✓	0						
Could be improved? (confidential info for PC)	In case of a negative or border-line decision, assess whether the paper can be improved based on your comment to become acceptable in the period of 15 days. If yes, the chairs may consider conditionally-accept the paper with final decision made based on a new version and response letter	text/score	✓			0	✓			No; Yes		
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.	text/score	✓			0						

Review Form

The form itself is shown below.

Relevance. Assess the relevance of the paper to the goals and topics at <http://stpis2017.blogs.dsv.su.se/goal-topics/>. If possible point out the topic number from this page when writing your comments. if implicitly relevant, suggest how to make it explicitly relevant

- 3: Explicitly relevant
- 2: Implicitly relevant
- 1: Not relevant

Categorization. If you do not agree with the paper categorization by the authors, you can reclassify it. For instance, if an experience report does not follow the guidelines, you might want to reclassify it as a research or idea paper. Explain you decision to reclassify. If possible give recommendations on what needs to be done to better adjust to the new category

- 7: The category is correct
- 6: Multimedia
- 5: Idea paper
- 4: Position paper
- 3: Experience report
- 2: Research paper
- 1: Poster

Originality. Assess originality of: ideas and results and presence of partial evaluation (FULL RESEARCH); interesting observations and lessons (EXPERIENCE REPORT); vision (IDEA); interesting question or position (POSITION); exciting presentation (MULTI-MEDIA)

- 3: Substantial amount of new or very interesting material

- 2: Some new or interesting material
 1: Nothing new or interesting; ;

Discussability. Rate the potential of the paper for raising useful and interesting discussion.

- 3: High
 2: Medium
 1: Low

Style. Is the style of the paper follows the recommendation given at <http://stpis2018.blogs.dsv.su.se/submission/> and guidelines given at <http://stpis2018.blogs.dsv.su.se/guidelines/>. If possible, give recommendations on improvement

- 3: Yes
 2: Partly
 1: No

Language. Evaluate the quality of the language used in, and the presentation of the paper. Give suggestions for improvement.

- 3: Good
 2: Acceptable
 1: Unacceptable

Practicality discussed?. Asses whether the paper discusses practical application of its results/suggestions. Desirable for all types of submissions, but especially for idea papers and research papers. Experience report should have it by default as this is part of lessons learned.

- 3: Yes
 2: To some extent
 1: No

Practical usefulness (*). Asses practical usefulness of the results. Identify areas were it could be useful

- 3: Definitely useful
 2: Could be useful
 1: Not useful

Overall evaluation (*). Scores required

- 3: strong accept
- 2: accept
- 1: weak accept
- 0: borderline paper
- 1: weak reject
- 2: reject
- 3: strong reject

Reviewer's confidence (*).

- 5: (expert)
- 4: (high)
- 3: (medium)
- 2: (low)
- 1: (none)

Justification and additional comments to the authors (*). Please, provide justification for your decision, if the decision is not clear from the detailed scores and comments to them. Provide recommendation to the authors on how to improve the paper.

Could be improved? (confidential info for PC). In case of a negative or border-line decision, assess whether the paper can be improved based on your comment to become acceptable in the period of 15 days. If yes, the chairs may consider conditionally-accept the paper with final decision made based on a new version and response letter

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.
