WAM 2017 PAPER SUBMISSION REVIEW INSTRUCTIONS

Go to http://cpaper.ctimeetingtech.com/wam2017 and login with your confidential username and password

After logging in, click on the 'Rating' tab on top of the page, you will then see all papers assigned to you in the 'To rate' tab

To Review and rate papers one by one in the online system

- Click on 'Rate' to the right side of the paper you would like to rate
- You will see the complete paper followed by the rating catalogue underneath. Authors will not be shown as the WAM 2017 rating is done anonymously
- Rate the respective paper and click on 'save and next' at the bottom of the page to continue to the next paper
- If you have been assigned your own paper, please click on the 'Conflict of Interest' button and you will not be able to proceed with that rating,

Download and/or print the papers, review them 'on paper' and add your ratings later online by using the Quickrate function

- Select the papers that you would like to download/print and click on download or print
- Authors will not be shown in the printed/downloaded document as the WAM 2017 rating is done anonymously
- Once you are ready to enter your ratings, log in to the online system, select the papers you want to rate and click on 'Quickrate' In the Quickrate function, only the rating catalogue will be shown. If you need to view the full paper and rating catalogue together on the screen, click on 'Rate'.

You can always stop rating by clicking on 'Back to overview' at the top of the page and log back in at a later time to complete your ratings

The system will keep track of the papers you still have to rate, the papers you have already rated, as well as the papers that you indicated to have a conflict of interest (see the three tabs 'To rate', 'Already rated', 'Conflict of interest')

WAM 2017 Reviewer Guidelines

Conflict of interest Button (Click here if you are an author of this paper or if you have another conflict of interest – you will not be able to rate this paper after clicking the button)

Comment Fields

Recommendation. Select one of the following:

- Definitely Reject

- Probably Reject
- Accept if Space Permits
- Definitely Accept

Best Paper Nominee

- Yes
- No

Comments to Authors

Please provide 5-10 specific comments to help authors improve their submissions.

Traditional Papers. Please follow standard journal and conference reviewer guidelines.

Developmental Papers are a relatively new submission type for WAM. There are three categories of developmental papers: Research proposals, conceptual papers, and empirical papers. Research proposals should include research questions or hypotheses, the literature that has informed the questions, and proposed data collection and analyses. An empirical paper should include the same elements as a research proposal submission and some preliminary analyses. Conceptual papers should include a description of the relevant literature, the need for/rationale for the paper, and some preliminary ideas for the theoretical contribution.

When deciding whether or not a developmental paper should be accepted for the conference, please consider two things:

1. Is there a good idea there?
There must be a good idea in the submission. Obviously it is difficult to define what constitutes a good idea, but please consider the following two questions: Could this idea be developed into a publishable paper? Will WAM members enjoy reading and discussing it?

2. Have the author(s) put some effort into developing this idea?
We want authors to send us ideas in their early stages; we do not want them to see the developmental track as an opportunity to get something accepted with minimal effort. Thus, developmental papers that show evidence of more effort on the part of the authors should receive more favorable evaluations than papers that show no such evidence. The criteria for developmental papers (listed above) set out what we would ideally like to see in submissions in each of the three categories: research proposals, conceptual papers, and empirical papers. While it is not necessary for a successful submission to have all of these elements, a submission that does so would have a stronger case for acceptance.

Please note that developmental papers should not be compared to traditional (full) papers, which will naturally contain more details about theory and/or methods.

Comments to Track Chair / Program Chair

Workshops and Symposiums should be evaluated on five criteria:

1) Relevance to an identified audience of participants
   Excellent (5)
   Very Good (4)
   Good (3)
   Fair (2)
   Poor (1)

2) Evidence of a dynamic and interactive session
   Excellent (5)
   Very Good (4)
   Good (3)
   Fair (2)
   Poor (1)

3) Interest to broader WAM membership
   Excellent (5)
   Very Good (4)
   Good (3)
   Fair (2)
   Poor (1)

4) Clarity of proposal narrative and session format
   Excellent (5)
   Very Good (4)
   Good (3)
   Fair (2)
   Poor (1)

5) Provision of useful “take-aways” for participants
   Excellent (5)
   Very Good (4)
   Good (3)
   Fair (2)
   Poor (1)