

## 6. Peer Review

Peer review is an important part of the conference organisation. The Programme Committee oversees the peer review process for all academic content along with recruitment and briefing of reviewers.

The maintenance of high-quality at DRS conferences is dependent on expert reviewers. Reviewers are drawn from a large list of experienced reviewers, many of whom have reviewed for previous DRS conferences. A list is maintained by the DRS which may be revised with additional reviewers.

Requirement	Comments	Notes/Questions
6.1 The DRS is responsible for setting up the Conference Submission and Peer Review system.	<p>The DRS is the publisher of the Proceedings and is therefore responsible for all aspects of peer-review.</p> <p>The conference management system that is currently used is ConfTool, which integrates the submission, review, scheduling, and (optionally) delegate payment.</p> <p>The DRS will pay the subscription to the Conference Management System and claim it as an expense from the conference budget (see item 4.12).</p> <p>All members of the Programme Committee (and subsequently Theme Track Chairs) should make themselves familiar with ConfTool.</p> <p>The Chair of the Programme Committee is responsible for providing appropriate permissions to all users of ConfTool.</p> <p>The local organisers should try to ensure that their registration systems can communicate with ConfTool (for example when checking that accepted authors have registered for the conference).</p>	

---

## 6.2

The DRS keeps a list of peer reviewers.

Reviewers must have had prior paper reviewing experience and be briefed appropriately.

New reviewers are always welcome. The Conference Chair or members of the Programme Committee may suggest new reviewers who have suitable experience.

This list is reviewed after each conference to exclude those who do not review adequately.

---

## 6.3

The process of review is double blind.

Double blind reviewing is where the reviewers and the author are unknown to each other ensuring a lack of bias in the review process.

---

## 6.4

For review, full papers should be anonymised

The call for research papers is for full papers only, not abstracts.

Authors' names, affiliations, references to authors' own work, and any other information that might identify authors, is to be removed from the initial paper submission.

Papers should be initially submitted in pdf format, final submissions should be in Word format to allow editing work to be carried out in compiling the proceedings.

When finally accepted, papers will have information restored by authors prior to publication.

---

## 6.5

Papers should state clearly the title, names and affiliations of authors, questions being addressed, methods used, and conclusions reached.

Initial filtering should try to eradicate weak research, work in progress where there are no significant findings to report, or research that is not relevant to the conference.

---

---

6.6

At least two reviewers assess the quality of each proposal.

A template for reviews is provided to reviewers in the Conference Management System.

Members of the Programme Committee (or theme track chairs, where appropriate) will provide a brief and confidential meta-review.

Following the outcome decision reviews should be allowed to see each other's reviews to enable a learning process to take place.

---

6.7

Authors are given instructions. Papers should be between 3000 and 5000 words.

The DRS will provide a paper template with instructions for authors.

The template should have the Conference Logo in the top left-hand corner of the front page.

---

6.8

Reviewers will provide fair feedback to authors.

Reviewers should in general not be sent more than 5 full papers to review.

Authors should expect fair and constructive feedback, and this is a condition of reviewing.

Members of the Programme Committee should usually be prepared to review larger numbers of papers in cases where reviewers fail to submit reviews.

Authors will be able to give feedback about the reviews they have had through the ConfTool system. The Programme Committee may decide to act on this should it be clear that fair treatment has not been given.

---

6.9

The three possible outcomes of the review process are: accept without revisions, accept with revisions, reject

Reviewers are required to give one overall grade for the paper between 1 (poor) and 10 (excellent).

In past conferences papers achieving a grade of around 6.5 have been accepted to the conference.

---

---

#### 6.10

The number of papers accepted for presentation will depend upon the quality threshold established by the Programme Committee.

In practice the Programme Committee sets the quality threshold (acceptance levels) taking the spaces available at the conference into account.

Normally, papers requiring major revisions will not be accepted.

DRS2014 accepted 132 papers and rejected 128 papers (50% acceptance).

DRS2016 accepted 225 papers and rejected 275 papers (45% acceptance).

DRS2018 accepted 200 papers and rejected 280 papers (42% acceptance).

DRS2020 accepted 133 papers and rejected 130 papers (50% acceptance)

---

#### 6.11

Following the review of full papers, successful authors will be notified with reviewers' comments to allow them to make appropriate revisions.

Adequate time should be allowed for authors to make their revisions.

---

#### 6.12

Further presentation formats may be submitted to and reviewed within the Conference Management system

These might include: Conversations, Workshops, Theme Tracks, etc.

DRS conferences have not generally had poster presentations, but this remains an option.

Other formats may be developed and prototyped by the Host Organisation in discussion with the DRS. Innovation is encouraged in this respect.

---

#### 6.13

Publication in the full proceedings will depend upon one author presenting the paper in person at the conference.

This should be made a clear stipulation in the detailed call for papers (or other formats for presentation). It must be reiterated in the final acceptance notice to authors.

Virtual presentation should be made available but presenters will need to have paid a virtual registration fee.

---