

# SimAUD 2018 Reviewer Guide

## INTRODUCTION

The Symposium on Simulation for Architecture and Urban Design (SimAUD) imagines a future where simulation is not simply an analysis technique, but rather an integral part of the design process. This vision calls for the combined ingenuity of architects, landscape architects, urbanists, building scientists and engineers, systems engineers, and human-computer interaction and computer graphics experts, as well as a common venue where this diverse group of people can benefit from a broad range of perspectives. Our ultimate goal is to promote collaboration across disciplines through not only papers and presentations, but also the sharing of videos, raw data, simulation frameworks and models, and ontological information. Thank you for being a part of this effort and community as a member of the **SimAUD 2018 Scientific Committee**.

For the peer review process, we aim to provide a positive experience for all authors by producing fair evaluations and valuable feedback. Even those whose manuscripts are ultimately rejected should feel their efforts were rewarded with suggestions on how to improve their submitted materials and future work. With this underlying objective, this guide will provide you with an outline of the review process and a few suggestions for your reviews.

## REVIEW PROCESS

- Reviewing will take place from **December, 2017** through **January, 2018** (with a few possible exceptions). We will communicate specific deadlines for reviews.
- Please let us know as soon as possible if you do not believe you will complete an assignment by the deadline, or if you believe one or more of your assignments is not sufficiently within your area of expertise.
- The review process is double-blind. Authors have been instructed to anonymize their work. Please proceed with a fair review even if the authors' identities have not been redacted.
- Once you have submitted a review, the online system will give you access to the other reviews pertaining to the same manuscript. Similarly, your review will be made available to the other reviewers. By mid-January you should be able to see all reviews for all manuscripts assigned to you. We expect there to be 3 reviews in total for each submission.
- When reviews are made available to other reviewers, they will be anonymous. However, certain reviewers may be engaged at a later stage to discuss borderline papers or discrepancies in reviewer opinions. In such cases we may share reviewer identities among the reviewers.

- After the reviews have been received and any subsequent discussions have concluded, the editors will make a decision on each manuscript:
  - Accept
  - Request for Minor Revisions
  - Request for Major Revisions
  - Request to Resubmit in Different Form
  - Reject
- For manuscripts with requested changes, a final decision will be made at a later date. For papers requiring major revisions, we may ask one of the reviewers to verify that their concerns have been adequately addressed.
- We encourage you to indicate in the confidential section of your review whether you are interested in receiving a revised version of the paper for a second evaluation. However, time constraints may prevent us from engaging all reviewers in the decisions on all borderline manuscripts. The shared access to reviews should help clarify the decisions made, but note that there will always be a few cases where no course of action can perfectly satisfy every opinion in the time available.

## SUGGESTIONS FOR REVIEWS

Please provide rigorous reviews, holding the submitted work to the highest of academic standards as you would for similar conferences and publication venues. In addition, we ask you to consider the suggestions below, which relate to issues of particular importance to SimAUD.

### Stated Contributions

In the comments section of your review, please state in your own words the authors' *actual* main contributions, keeping in mind that the *stated* contributions may differ. If needed, explain to the authors how they might reframe their work so that the stated and actual contributions are consistent.

### Graphic Quality

Please observe the quality and clarity of all figures, tables, and equations, noting that accepted short papers (4 pages) and full papers (8 pages) will be printed in full color. The size and resolution of each image should be appropriate with respect to its content. When clarity is an issue, images should not be excessively scaled down to adhere to a page limit (though adherence to page limits is important). All informative text on images should be readable when printed.

### Short Documents, Projects, Videos, and Data Sets

Contributions to SimAUD can take many different forms; please keep this in mind if asked to review short papers (4 pages), projects, videos, or data sets.

For a short document, it is understood that the project described may be incomplete. Consider whether the project objectives and progress-to-date are well communicated, and whether an oral presentation is likely to inspire the audience and result in additional useful feedback for the authors.

We hope you will download any accompanying video or data set, and make it clear that the item was considered as part of your review. A video may provide an accessible overview of the authors' work, or illuminate concepts which can only be partially described by text and static images. A dataset may be reused by the community in a variety of contexts, and is therefore a potential contribution even if the associated work is somewhat less rigorous.

**Academic Integrity**

Please take some time to search the literature and help us ensure all that accepted work is original with respect to previous publications, and absolutely free of plagiarism. If you have any concerns about academic integrity, but are unsure on account of the anonymity of the paper, simply point out any similar publications in your confidential comments. The editors will investigate the issue further and make a judgment.

**FINAL WORDS**

- Further advice on writing reviews can be found in [1].
- The appendix below reflects the contents of the review form on the online system.
- We welcome any questions you may have about your assignments, as well as any suggestions on how we might improve the review process either this year or in future years. Please feel free to contact all or any one of us by email.
- Once again, thank you for volunteering your time and expertise.

**REFERENCES**

1. Roscoe, T. Writing reviews for systems conferences. <http://people.inf.ethz.ch/troscoe/pubs/review-writing.pdf>. (2007), 1-6.

**APPENDIX – PREVIEW OF THE REVIEW FORM**

**Scored Evaluation**

Category	Score (1 – 5)
Overall Quality	
Relevance to SimAUD	
Originality	
Significance	

Category	Score (1 – 5)
Organization	
Clarity	

*Note: Possible Scores (1 – 5)*

- 5 - Excellent
- 4 - Good
- 3 - Neutral
- 2 - Poor
- 1 - Unacceptable

**Expertise**

Provide your expertise (reviewer) in the topic area of this paper.

- 4 - Expert
- 3 - Knowledgeable
- 2 - Passing Knowledge
- 1 - No Knowledge

**The Review**

Write your review of the paper here. Please identify positive and negatives of the work and the paper, plus any suggestions for revisions.

**Confidential Comments**

Comments for the review committee that will NOT be sent to the authors: