

HFES ASPIRE Reviewer Guide

Table of Contents

Expectations	2
Your Role as a Reviewer	2
Submission Structure	2
Evaluation Dimensions and Scales	2
Expectations	4
Writing a Good Review	5
Summary	5
Major Concerns	5
Minor Concerns	5
Do's and Don'ts	6

Expectations

Your Role as a Reviewer

You are here to help submitters improve and to help the conference make fair decisions. Together those contribute to ensuring the high-quality of the HFES ASPIRE technical program.

Since ASPIRE employs a two-step approach to the peer-review (Step 1 with extended abstracts for presentation at the conference; Step 2 with extended abstracts or full papers for publication in the Proceedings), your reviews must be adapted to the Step. In both cases, though, your reviews shall be specific, constructive, and grounded.

Submission Structure

For the main submission categories (lecture, case studies, posters, demos, alternate), authors are specifically asked to address five categories of content. Here is how they are framed in the template used by authors.

Your review should assess whether those sections are satisfactorily addressed (note that authors are allowed to change the titles of the sections, but the targeted content should still be adhered to):

- **INTRODUCTION:** This is the section where authors can describe the motivation, need, or objectives for the contribution.
- **BACKGROUND:** This is the section where authors include the context for their contribution or relevant prior research.
- **APPROACH:** This is the section where authors describe their methods or procedures, any experimental design, and/or any analytical/statistical method they employed.
- **OUTCOME:** This is the section where authors list and discuss their results and findings.
- **CONCLUSION:** This is the section where authors mention the applications or applicability of their contribution, provide lessons learned and/or takeaways for the HFES community, and/or suggest future work.

Evaluation Dimensions and Scales

In addition to verifying that the sections above are addressed, you must provide specific ratings in the online review form. Your scores will target 6 dimensions about the submission and 1 dimension about your expertise in the domain.

1. Complete Work:

- a. Does this proposal represent a completed version of the research or practical contribution, sufficient for review? Note that a contribution reporting on a completed phase or section of a larger endeavor is acceptable if the phase or section are clearly identified and stand on their own.
- b. Review response: Yes / No

2. Writing Quality:

- a. This criterion asks you to evaluate the clarity in communication and understandability of the proposal's main ideas. Consider these questions as you evaluate the proposal: Is the proposal well written, with correct spelling and grammar? Does the author use the available length to effectively communicate the main ideas of the proposal? Does the proposal have a clear statement of purpose, presented in a coherent and logical manner? Are the organization and presentation format clearly explained? Does the proposal provide a sufficient overview of the topic and expected benefits to attendees?

- b. Review response: 1-7 scale, 1 = Low Quality : 7 = High Quality

3. Quality of Research

- a. This criterion asks you to evaluate the quality of research, including the use of appropriate methodology and/or statistical analyses and the interpretation of findings. Consider these questions as you evaluate the proposal: Does the proposal take an original or creative approach to investigate the research question(s) addressed?
- b. *For research proposals:* Do the hypotheses pose central questions that summarize what the study is measuring? Are the chosen experimental design and methodology reasonable given the objectives of the work? Are the statistical techniques used in the analyses appropriate for the given research study? Does the interpretation of the results offer insight into the topic?
- c. *For practice-oriented proposals:* Does the proposal emphasize how the topic relates to the actual practice of HF/E? Does the discussion sufficiently explain the practical applications and implications of the work presented?
- d. *For theoretical proposals:* Does the proposal sufficiently explain the practical implications of the theoretical arguments presented and identify future research needed to test these hypotheses?
- e. Review response: 1-7 scale, 1 = Low Quality : 7 = High Quality

4. Substance of Contribution

- a. This criterion asks you to evaluate the theoretical and/or practical contribution(s) made by the proposal. Consider these questions as you evaluate the proposal: Does the proposal describe an original or creative approach to presenting the information that is to be conveyed? Does the proposal present a significant HF/E contribution to this technical area? Is the proposal's topic current or cutting edge rather than outdated? Is the work described topical and relevant to the attendees interested in this technical area? Does the proposal include strong conclusions and/or recommendations for future research?
- b. Review response: 1-7 scale, 1 = Minimal Contribution : 7 = Substantial Contribution

5. Title Representativeness

- a. Does the title appropriately represent the topic of the proposal?
- b. Review response: Yes / No

6. Overall Quality

- a. Please provide your overall assessment of the quality of this proposal.
- b. Review response: 1-7 scale, 1 = Poor : 7 = Excellent

7. Level of Expertise

- a. Please rate your level of expertise on this proposal's topic
- b. Review response: 1 = Low Expertise : 7 = High Expertise

Expectations

It is critical that you take slightly different approaches in reviewing the dimensions listed previously at Step 1 vs. at Step 2.

Step 1: Extended Abstract (≤2 pages)

- All submitters start here with an extended abstract of up to 2 pages.
- **Purpose of the review:** Decide if this work belongs at the conference.
- **Focus on:**
 - Relevance to HFES and the Technical Group for which you are reviewing
 - Clarity of the problem and contribution
 - Soundness (not perfection)
 - Likely interest to attendees
- In Step 1, you should not expect exhaustive lit reviews, citations, methodology, or results.

Step 2: Extended Abstract or Full Paper (≤5 pages)

- Authors whose submissions were accepted at Step 1 may optionally decide to submit to the Proceedings, for which a second peer-review occurs, either on an updated version of the extended abstract or a full paper up to 5 pages.
- **Purpose of this review:** Decide if this work belongs in the proceedings.
- **For Step 2 extended abstracts, focus on:**
 - Updates to the submission that address Step 1 feedback
- **For Step 2 full papers, focus on:**
 - Technical rigor and methodological clarity
 - Strength of evidence and analysis
 - Quality of writing and structure
 - Whether conclusions follow from results
- In Step 2, the bar for rejection should be high (very hard to do):
 - Only reject extended abstracts for publications if the recommendations from Step 1 were not followed or if the Step 2 submission is vastly different from Step 1.
 - Only reject full papers if the core standards for publications are not met (massive rigor or methodology gap not identified in Step 1, very poor writing quality or structure flow, vast difference between the Step 1 and Step 2 submissions).

Writing a Good Review

In addition to the ratings listed in the previous section, you **must** provide a written review for the authors, which will also be helpful to Technical Group Program Chair.

We recommend that your comments follow the Summary, Major Concerns, and Minor Concerns.

Summary

In order to ground your review and understanding of the contribution, we recommend that you include the following:

- One sentence summarizing the main point of the contribution. You may optionally add a few words about key insights or lessons learned.
- One sentence summarizing the value of this contribution to the HFES audience.
- One or two sentences summarizing what was generally positive about the contribution and what wasn't (this is to cue the next section).

Major Concerns

If you have major concerns about the submission, explicitly list them with a constructive path to resolution (i.e., how the authors can close the identified gap). Major concerns may cover:

- **Relevance:** The topic is not relevant to HFES or the Technical Group, etc.
- **Novelty:** No new findings are shared; the content is redundant with prior publications, etc.
- **Significance:** The contribution only supports marginally significant outcomes; the contribution has no practical impact, etc.
- **Methodology:** The approach is not aligned with the objectives; statistical tests are applied inappropriately, etc.
- **Soundness:** The arguments are not coherent or consistent; the data or outcomes do not back up conclusions, etc.
- If there are no major concerns, say so.

Minor Concerns

You should list any item you see relevant to improving the submission, including, but not limited to, grammatical errors, typos, missing references, superfluous details, confusing or poorly-worded expressions, and readability issues (including for graphics, figures, and tables).

If there are no minor concerns, say so.

Note that you may additionally provide a comment to the Technical Group Program Chair, which will not be visible to authors. We recommend that you use that comment to make a recommendation for acceptance or rejection if you feel strongly either way.

Do's and Don'ts

As you address the expectations listed above, please ensure you adhere to the dos and don'ts:

Do

- **Do remain specific, constructive, and grounded in the submission:** be direct but diplomatic, and focused on what was submitted (not what you wish had been!)
- **Do accept the review promptly:** the timeline is extremely tight, so please accept your assignments quickly. If you cannot complete the review within the allotted time, please contact the assigner.
- **Do cite specific sections or pages:** when you identify concerns, tie them to specific parts of the submission, so authors know where to look.
- **Do separate major issues from minor suggestions:** be explicit about what constitutes a hurdle for acceptance vs. a small adjustment.
- **Do explain why something is a concern:** don't just say something is a problem, explain what the impact of the problem is.
- **Do suggest concrete improvements:** provide the authors with elements they can use both for their presentation at the conference and for their publication in the Proceedings should they choose to submit.

Don't

- **⚠ Do not use AI:** you would be violating the intellectual property rights of the authors, their institutions, and HFES.
- **Do not write one-line or generic reviews:** they are of use to no one (authors, TG Program Chairs, Conference Chair).
- **Do not use dismissive or sarcastic language:** first, that's not constructive; second, it may not be understood for a variety of reasons.
- **Do not penalize style or topic preference:** neither is a relevant dimension of review.
- **Do not penalize for "not enough details" under the two-page constraint:** the two-page limit on extended abstracts makes it hard to provide a ton of depth for all aspects of a contribution.