AIS Special Interest Group on Education (SIGED) International Conference

AIS SIGED Reviewers' Guidelines

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. A more specific theme direction is given to each year's conference.

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

- Completed research paper – An original paper that has not been published elsewhere. The submission should be maximum 6000 words and must include an abstract (150-word max) along with the body of the full paper. The reference list and appendices (if any) are excluded from the word count.
- Research in progress – A submission of original work which is substantially near completion. The submission should be at least 2500 words in length, and must include an abstract.
- Descriptive case study - A submission that reports specific pedagogical or curricular strategies being employed or under development. The submission should not be longer than 6000 words.
- Opinion papers - A submission that focuses on issues related to the theme of the conference. The opinions expressed in these papers should be well-developed and, where appropriate, supported by evidence, while keeping in mind that these are opinion pieces rather than traditional research papers. The submission should be up to 2500 words, excluding the abstract, reference list, and appendices.
- Proposal for panel discussion or tutorial - A proposal to offer a panel discussion or a tutorial on a topic related to the theme of the conference. The submission must include the names and affiliations of panellists who have agreed to participate, a 1-2-page summary of the topic and a structure of how the session will be presented.

All submissions to the conference will be double-blind peer reviewed and will be checked for plagiarism. In regards to the use of AI and AI-assisted technologies, authors have been asked to limit the use of such technologies towards improving the readability and language of their work.

The reviewing system 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 by commenting on writing quality, methodology used, topic suitability, and novelty and overall contribution.

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 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, 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, 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.