



AIS SIGED Reviewers Guidelines – Version 2.0

The annual conference is a forum that encourages the free flow of original, unique, and novel ideas from the IS community about the main topic of education. In addition to “traditional” research articles, submissions in the form of case studies, survey articles, tutorials, discussion and opinion papers, and other materials of general interest will be considered. Acceptance is based on the reviewers’ assessment of the submission’s contribution to the conference theme in terms of its originality, importance, and uniqueness.

Submissions may be in the form and are not limited to one or more of the following:

- Completed research paper – up to 6000 words, excluding the abstract, reference list, and appendices.
- Research in progress – up to 2500 words, excluding the abstract, reference list, and appendices.
- Descriptive case study - up to 4000 words, excluding the abstract, reference list, and appendices.
- Extended abstract - up to 2500 words, excluding the abstract, reference list, and appendices.
- Opinion papers - up to 2500 words, excluding the abstract, reference list, and appendices.
- Proposal for panel discussion or tutorial - up to 2500 words, excluding the abstract, reference list, and appendices.

The use of artificial intelligence (AI)–generated text in an article shall be disclosed in the acknowledgements section of any paper submitted to the conference. The sections of the paper that use AI-generated text shall have a citation to the AI system used to generate the text.

This document presents a guideline for reviewers to make an acceptance recommendation, articulate the value of the contribution, and classify the submission’s content.

The reviewing systems allows for the following acceptance recommendations:

1. Reject: Content inappropriate to the conference or has little merit.
2. Probable Reject: Basic content or presentation flaws or poorly written.
3. Marginal Tend to Reject: Not as badly flawed; major effort necessary to make acceptable but content well-covered in the literature already.
4. Marginal Tend to Accept: Content has merit, but accuracy, clarity, completeness, and/or writing should and could be improved in time.
5. Clear Accept: Content, presentation, and writing meet professional norms; improvements may be advisable but acceptable as is.
6. Must Accept: Candidate for outstanding submission. Suggested improvements are still appropriate.

Regarding the contribution, we ask the reviewers to identify the value of the contribution as being:

- Highly theoretical.
- Tends towards theoretical.
- Balanced theory and practice.
- Tends toward practical.
- Highly practical.

In general, the content of the contribution can be characterized by reviewers as:

- New information.
- Valuable confirmation of present knowledge.
- Clarity to present understanding.
- New perspective, issue, or problem definition.
- Not much.
- Other.

Reviewers should consider several important aspects to ensure a thorough and meaningful evaluation when reviewing research papers. Here are the key elements reviewers should focus on:

1. **Research Question and Significance:** Assess the clarity and relevance of the research question. Consider whether the study addresses a critical gap in knowledge and contributes to the field.
2. **Methodology and Design:** Evaluate the study's methodology, including the research design, sampling techniques, data collection methods, and analytical approaches. Assess whether the methods are appropriate for addressing the research question and if they are rigorous and transparent. In the cases of an extended abstract, opinion papers, or panel discussions, less emphasis is placed on this section when reviewing the submission.
3. **Data Analysis and Interpretation:** Examine the data analysis methods employed and evaluate their appropriateness for the research question. Assess the soundness of the statistical or qualitative analysis and determine whether the results are accurately presented and interpreted. In the cases of a research-in-progress submission, extended abstract, opinion papers, or panel discussions, less emphasis is placed on this section when reviewing the submission.
4. **Results and Findings:** Evaluate the strength of the study's findings and how much they support the research question. Consider the significance, novelty, and generalizability of the results. Assess whether the authors adequately discuss any limitations or alternative explanations. In the cases of a research-in-progress submission, extended abstract, opinion papers, or panel discussions, less emphasis is placed on this section when reviewing the submission.
5. **Literature Review and Background:** Assess the authors' understanding and presentation of existing literature relevant to the research question. Determine if the study's rationale

is well-grounded in previous research and if the authors comprehensively review relevant studies.

6. **Clarity and Organization:** Evaluate the paper's overall structure, clarity, and coherence. Assess whether the authors clearly communicate their objectives, methods, and findings. Determine if the paper adheres to the standard format and includes all necessary sections.
7. **Ethical Considerations:** Assess whether the study adheres to ethical guidelines and regulations. Evaluate the authors' transparency regarding potential conflicts of interest and any ethical concerns related to the research design, participants, or data collection.
8. **Contribution to the Field:** Consider the paper's contribution to the broader field of research. Evaluate the originality, significance, and potential impact of the study. Assess whether the findings have implications for theory, practice, future research, or potential implications for incomplete research.
9. **Recommendations for Improvement:** Offer constructive feedback and suggestions for improving the paper. Identify areas where the study could be strengthened, such as the methodology, analysis, or presentation of results.
10. **Overall Impression:** Provide a summary of your overall impression of the paper, including its strengths and weaknesses. Consider the paper's readability, clarity of language, and potential audience relevance.

By addressing these aspects in their reviews, reviewers can comprehensively evaluate research papers and help maintain the quality and integrity of scholarly work.

The ten points above are only summary points. For a more comprehensive discussion on reviewing papers, please visit <https://authorservices.wiley.com/Reviewers/journal-reviewers/how-to-perform-a-peer-review/step-by-step-guide-to-reviewing-a-manuscript.html>