

Dos and Don'ts (Ver.1.3)

For Reviewers

"Do not throw away gems even if you can pick up stones (Do not reject good papers even if you can pick up bad papers)"

- (1) Consider to accept papers with 60% completion rate and do not require them with 90% completion rate; publish not only excellent papers but also papers that provide valuable information to members.
- (2) Review papers in not point-deduction scoring system but point-addition one. For example, consider accepting a paper when its novelty or usefulness seems to be high and valuable to readers, or, when it is hard to evaluate its usefulness at that time and would be better to leave its evaluation to readers or future.
- (3) Papers beyond reviewers' decisions might have major impacts on researches.
- (4) Readers judge whether or not papers are interesting.
- (5) Judge by listing up acceptance conditions.
- (6) Evaluate papers from the viewpoint of whether the papers propose new ideas, or propose new and nontrivial usage methods that combine conventional ideas, or indicate data showing newly findings.
- (7) Do not judge that the novelty of a proposal with different realization methods for the same purpose as other proposals is low.
- (8) Evaluate papers from the viewpoint of whether the usefulness of proposed methods is indicated by performance evaluations etc., or the technical effectiveness is confirmed objectively by products or works open to the public.
- (9) Do not request practicability for every case. Do not reject papers just because the practicability is unclear.
- (10) The reviewer should be aware that the following reason demeans the significance of experimentation and/or implementation studies.
 - This authors just implements and confirms their previous studies on a real system, so lacks any originality.
- (11) The reviewer should remember that he/she might make mistakes in reviewing. Moreover, he/she would deprive the authors of a chance to publish their research works, because the reviewer's position is superior to the authors'.
- (12) The reviewer should not request the authors to perform experiments which cover everything, with a comment such as:
 - The evaluation is insufficient.

[Difference from the reviewing process of international conferences]

(13) Different from international conference, the reviewing process for journal gives another chance for the authors to revise their manuscript.

or

It is not true that the manuscript is reviewed only once, in contrast to the review in international conferences.

or

The second review exists, in contrast to international conferences where the manuscript is reviewed only once.

(14) Different from international conference, the reviewing process for journal never intends to output the ranking of submitted manuscripts.

or

The review never intends to rank the manuscript with other manuscripts, in contrast to the review in international conferences.

(15) The reviewer should not judge acceptance or rejection of each manuscript according to the supposed acceptance rate such that many international conferences set, but according to the merits and/or progressions appeared in the manuscript from general and objective viewpoints.

[Acceptance condition should be concrete]

(16) Even when the reviewer decides the rejection of the manuscript, the reviewer should clarify the insufficient and/or weak points of the manuscript and also clarify how to refine the paper, since the overall decision is given by the meta-reviewer.

(17) Acceptance conditions should not be ambiguous.

(18) The reviewer should not present conditions for acceptance with subjective criteria for satisfaction, IOW, conditions which can be interpreted in multiple ways among the authors, the reviewer, and the meta-reviewer.

(19) Comments of reviewers should not contain subjective statements like "there is not enough novelty ..."

(20) Comments of reviewers should not contain derogative expressions like "undergraduate level ..."

(21) Comments of reviewers should not contain other aggressive expressions.

(22) Inadequate comments of reviewers can be regarded as malicious rejections and cause objections from the authors.

[The judgment of the acceptance or rejection is a range of the conditions of acceptance]

- (23) The judgments of reviewers for revised papers have to be done without additional conditions for acceptance.
- (24) The judgments of reviewers for revised papers have to be neutral from the beliefs of the reviewers on the subject.
- (25) Discussing the true value of a paper is not a matter of the reviewers of the paper, but of the readers of the paper.

[Provide the original paper for the judgment of rejection]

- (26) Provide the references of the original papers if the review has an objection against the originality of the paper.
- (27) Provide the references of the papers which are sufficiently similar to if the review has an objection against the originality of the paper.
- (28) Do not write your guess without concrete evidence, e.g., "Such (authors') arguments/discussions should have been done in some famous conferences and/or on printed books."
- (29) It cannot be enough reason for rejection that referred documents (papers, books, etc.) or open sources are too old.
- (30) When a referee declines a paper's novelty by asserting that proposed method is just confirming an idea on some published things based on his/her subjective interpretation or opinion, the referee should take into account the risk of misinterpretation or wrong opinion.
- (31) Do not write a complaint such as "Do not assume a referee as a search system for academic resources."
- (32) All written things in the field of "Reason for rejection" are reasons for rejection; they are not personal opinions.
- (33) Do not write your guess without evidence as if a referee knew each and every case, e.g., "Proposed method is not feasible since assumed situations/conditions for proposed method are very rare cases."
- (34) Do not write your guess without evidence that the proposed idea is too simple to identify enough novelty. Such a reason is disadvantageous for the authors if the judgment is wrong. Instead, introduce existing technologies.

[Miscellaneous]

- (35) Do not contact the authors directly.
- (36) Referees should avoid descriptions which give hints for identifying the referee.