Reviewing Guidelines

Members of the Program Committee (PC) assist a submission's Senior Program Committee member (SPC) by writing a first-tier review for the paper, and participating actively in the discussion phase.

Every paper has been assigned a Senior Program Committee member (SPC) and three Program Committee members (PCs). As a PC, your job is to provide critical assessments of the papers assigned to you based on the review form that we have prepared (see below). For each paper assigned to you, your review and the reviews by two your fellow reviewers will form the basis for a discussion about the paper.

The SPC will lead the discussion, and if necessary flag the paper for additional review by a Secondary SPC (2SPC). The 2SPC will provide that review without seeing the other reviews, and then join the discussion. Based on the discussion, the SPC will arrive at a recommended decision. This recommended decision will be passed on to the Program Chairs and used as input to the Program Committee Meeting.

The review form has ten questions to answer for every submission:

- Relevance to SIGIR: the relevance of this paper to SIGIR
- Originality of work: how original the work described in this paper is
- Technical soundness: quality of the the technical content of this paper
- Quality of presentation: the presentation of this paper
- Impact of ideas or results: whether this paper contains impactful contributions to the IR community.
- Adequacy of citations: how the paper discusses and compares with related work.
- Reproducibility of methods: whether researchers can reproduce the methods and results described in the paper.
- Overall recommendation
- Reviewer's confidence
- Nominated for Best Paper: whether this paper should be nominated as a best paper candidate

Please assign a score for each of these questions. In the text area of "Comments to the Author(s)", you should supply a detailed rationale for the scores you have assigned across the first ten questions.

Your review is not just a vote for whether the paper will be accepted; it is essential input to a discussion amongst the reviewing team and to the Program Chairs. It is also the input to the authors to guide them with the changes suggested, and to help them understand the outcome of the review process. You are assisting your your fellow PC members, the SPCs, and the Program Chairs by providing arguments for or against acceptance.

In some cases, there will be divergence amongst reviewers' numerical ratings of the paper; if you provide only a rating and terse summary, without an adequate rationale, it will not be helpful.

Start your review with an assessment of what you consider to be the main contribution of the paper. Please do not just repeat what the authors say they did. You should provide your own summary of what you gained by reading the paper.

Whether you like or dislike a paper, please say so in a manner that is helpful to the authors and informative to your area chairs. (You will be asked to rewrite reviews that do not meet this expectation.)

You will notice the “Reproducibility of methods” criterion. This question is **not** about the use of proprietary data. It is about whether you think the authors provide sufficient details to reproduce the work.

Do you think that other researchers would be able to reproduce the method and/or results presented in the paper *if they had access to the same or similar resources*? Are the descriptions of the methods used detailed and accurate? Given the resources used in the paper, or (if they are unavailable) similar resources, could researchers carry out similar experiments to verify the results? What further description could the authors provide?

In the text box labeled “Summary of your review”, please summarize your main points. It is important to point out weaknesses and validity issues, but it is equally important to identify the contribution of a submission. Ultimately, a submission’s acceptance depends on its novel contribution, not perfection. Note again that we are looking for an evaluation of the paper, not just a recommendation.

One issue that may arise is that authors miss some of the prior research that has been published in the area. This should be regarded as being a fatal flaw *only if the missing work critically affects their conclusions*; remember, authors will have opportunity to make small editorial changes to their papers (including adding missing references) if they are accepted

If you do regard a paper as being unacceptable because of lack of reference to prior work, you should supply sufficient detail about this prior research in the form a complete reference ideally including its DOI, so that the authors can understand why you believe their paper should not be accepted. We encourage you to provide this level of detail for all references that you consider missing in the submission.

Thank you for your contributions to creating an excellent program for SIGIR 2018!

(This guideline is drafted based on previous SIGIR conferences’ review guidelines. Many thanks to the previous PC Chairs for their contributions.)