

REVIEW GUIDELINES & FORM FOR RESEARCH BASED SUBMISSIONS

1.	Title of submission:
2.	Conference Track/Research Area:
3.	Type of submission: Research-based
4.	Submission Category: (i) Long Paper (ii) Concise Paper (iii) Poster (iv) Workshop
5.	Instructions <ul style="list-style-type: none">• In section above, complete the fields (i) title of submission, and (ii) select the submission category.• Each submission is to be reviewed using the review form below. The review form has been developed to provide a systematic way of assessing the paper submissions to the conference.• Reviewers are requested to use the form for guidance by reading the guiding questions, then select the appropriate score and provide comments to support the score for each item.• Items 1-8 have to be scored and supporting comments provided for each.• Lastly, total the scores and provide a final score out of 40 points at the end of the form.• This is a double-blind peer review process, the identity of the reviewers will not be revealed to the authors.

Submission Review Assessment Form

	Guiding Questions	Score/Comments
1.	The Abstract	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Abstract is the portion of the paper where the authors provide a summary that presents the paper's most important features. The Abstract should be succinct, yet able to stand alone and be understood without reading the paper. In the Abstract, the authors should give a succinct account of the purpose, methods, findings and significance of the study within 150-250 words <p>Guiding questions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can the Abstract be understood without reading the paper? Does the Abstract adequately summarize the essential details - purpose, methods, findings and significance of the study? Does the abstract avoid unnecessary extraneous information such as citations of literature reviewed, unfamiliar abbreviations, tables, figures etc? 	<p>Excellent 5 Very Good 4 Good 3 Fair 2 Weak 1</p> <p>Provide comments to support your assessment</p>
2.	Introduction Section	
	<p>The Introduction should introduce the problem, state why it is important, and outline the rationale, purpose, design and context of the study.</p> <p>The introduction should make a clear and cogent argument that the study is important and possesses value. This can be done by indicating a specific gap in previous research, by raising a question, a hypothesis, or need, or by extending previous knowledge in some way.</p> <p>Guiding questions</p> <p>Does the introduction:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Introduce the problem and provide an overview of what the study enquired into, the background, history and/or context of the study, and the purpose and objectives of the study? 	<p>Excellent 5 Very Good 4 Good 3 Fair 2 Weak 1</p> <p>Provide comments to support your assessment</p>



	Guiding Questions	Score/Comments										
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrate that the area of research is important, critical, interesting, problematic, relevant, or otherwise worthy of investigation? • Introduce and review key sources of prior research in that area to show where gaps exist or where prior research has been inadequate in addressing the research problem? • Include a relevant review of literature and briefly describe, analyze, compare or criticize the previous research in this area and relate this to the current investigation? Does the cited literature: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Only report on work which is directly relevant and has contributed to the study. ○ Only cite sources which demonstrate the links between the previous and current work. ○ The literature review should not simply provide a long string of citations without any explanations about their key points, significance or differences. • Describe the remaining organizational structure of the paper? • Overall does the introduction help the reader to understand the main problem that the study tackles? 											
3.	Research Methods Section											
	<p>In this section the authors should describe in sufficient detail the methodological approach, the sample, the context, the participants, the tools used and the procedures. Readers will judge the reliability, validity or trustworthiness of the work by this section.</p> <p>Guiding questions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are the modes of inquiry employed well executed and appropriate to the particular problem? • Is the conceptual framework/ type of study conducted e.g. quantitative, qualitative or mixed method focused and well explained? • Is the research problem/question, the study participants, study instruments, context and circumstances sufficiently described? 	<table border="0"> <tr> <td>Excellent</td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Very Good</td> <td>4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Good</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Fair</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Weak</td> <td>1</td> </tr> </table> <p>Provide comments to support your assessment</p>	Excellent	5	Very Good	4	Good	3	Fair	2	Weak	1
Excellent	5											
Very Good	4											
Good	3											
Fair	2											
Weak	1											



	Guiding Questions	Score/Comments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the author describe how the data was collected, summarized and analysed? • Does the author describe how the study was conducted in sufficient detail to allow readers to evaluate the appropriateness of the research design? • Does the author describe the measures taken to address issues of trustworthiness (reliability and validity) of the study and subsequent findings/results? 	
4.	The Findings/Results Section	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In this section, the reviewer should examine whether the authors systematically and clearly announce the study findings. • If the results are unclear, the reviewer must decide whether the analysis of the data was poorly executed or whether the section is poorly organized. The latter need not be a fatal flaw, whereas the former usually indicates that the paper is unacceptable for publication. • The organization of this section is an important consideration for authors and reviewers alike. If the authors outline a sequence of steps in the Methods section, presenting the results of each step separately will help the reader and reviewer place the findings in perspective. <p>Guiding questions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are the findings/results clearly substantiated and logical based on the methods and data/evidence provided in the proposal? • Are the findings/results reasonable and expected, or are they unexpected? • Are there findings/results that are introduced that are not preceded by an appropriate discussion in the Methods section? 	<p>Excellent 5 Very Good 4 Good 3 Fair 2 Weak 1</p> <p>Provide comments to support your assessment</p>
5.	The Discussion Section	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This section is often considered the most 	



	Guiding Questions	Score/Comments
	<p>important part of a research paper because it most effectively demonstrates the researcher’s ability to think critically about an issue, to develop creative solutions to problems based on the findings, and to formulate a deeper, more profound understanding of the research problem being studied.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The discussion section should focus on the scientific/scholarly and/or practical significance of the study <p>Guiding questions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the discussion concise? If not, how should it be shortened? If a hypothesis was proposed, do the authors state whether it was verified or falsified? Alternatively, if no hypothesis was proposed, do the authors state whether their research question was answered? Are the authors’ conclusions justified by the findings/results found in the study? If there are unexpected results, do the authors adequately account for them? Do the authors note limitations of the study? Are there additional limitations that should be noted? Do the authors show how the study engages with previous studies as relates to theoretical or applied significance? Do the authors provide a thoughtful discussion on the implications of the study for addressing critical issues within the field and topic under investigation? 	<p>Excellent 5 Very Good 4 Good 3 Fair 2 Weak 1</p> <p>Provide comments to support your assessment</p>
6.	The Conclusion Section	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The conclusion is intended to help the reader understand why the research should matter to them after they have finished reading the article. A conclusion is not merely a summary of the findings or a re-statement of the research problem but a synthesis of key points. For most articles, one well-developed paragraph is 	<p>Excellent 5 Very Good 4 Good 3 Fair 2 Weak 1</p> <p>Provide comments to support</p>



	Guiding Questions	Score/Comments										
	<p>sufficient for a conclusion, although in some cases, a two-or-three paragraph conclusion may be required.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It presents the last word on the issues you raised in the article. Just as the introduction gives a first impression to the reader, the conclusion offers a chance to leave a lasting impression. <p>Guiding questions Do the authors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Highlight key points in the analysis or findings. Provide a summary of their thoughts and convey the larger implications of the study. Succinctly answer the "so what?" question by placing the study within the context of past research about the topic investigated; Demonstrate the importance of their ideas and elaborate on the significance of the findings for research, practice or policy as appropriate? Introduce possible new or expanded ways of thinking about the research problem. This does not refer to introducing new information [which should be avoided], but to offer new insight and creative approaches for framing/contextualizing the research problem based on the results of the study. 	<p>your assessment</p>										
7.	<p>Paper's timeliness?</p> <p>Guiding question</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the paper timely and relevant to a current problem or specific research issue in open, distance and eLearning? 	<p>Timeliness of the topic?</p> <table data-bbox="1092 1381 1271 1556"> <tr> <td>Excellent</td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Very Good</td> <td>4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Good</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Fair</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Weak</td> <td>1</td> </tr> </table> <p>Provide comments to support your assessment</p>	Excellent	5	Very Good	4	Good	3	Fair	2	Weak	1
Excellent	5											
Very Good	4											
Good	3											
Fair	2											
Weak	1											



	Guiding Questions	Score/Comments
8.	Quality of Writing/ Organization	
	<p>Guiding questions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is your overall impression of the writing/organization? • Is the paper legible, well written with few grammatical errors? • Is the paper properly organized leading to a coherent account? • Are there important references that are not mentioned that should be noted? 	<p>Quality of writing/organization</p> <p>Excellent 5 Very Good 4 Good 3 Fair 2 Weak 1</p> <p>Provide comments to support your assessment</p>
9.	Overall Recommendation	
	<p>The three reasons cited most often by reviewers for acceptance of a paper (which accounted for approximately 50% of positive comments) were,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • first, the paper was considered timely and relevant to a current problem; • second, the paper was considered well written, logical, and easy to comprehend; • and third, the study was well designed and had appropriate methodology <p>Guiding questions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is your overall global recommendation for this paper? 	<p>What is your overall recommendation for this paper?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accept • Accept Pending Minor Revisions • Reconsider After Major Revisions • Reject <p>Total Score/40</p>



	Guiding Questions	Score/Comments
	Overall comments for the Conference Committee	
	Overall comments for the Author(s)	

For queries about this document send an email to submissions@avu.org
Last update April 14 2015

