EVALUATION CRITERIA

Interactive Sonification Workshop

Evaluation Criteria

The papers submitted to the ISon will be rated from 1 to 5 according to the following criteria:

- *Novelty and originality of the paper*: rate the novelty and originality of the work presented in the paper.
    - A pioneering piece of work. Striking novel ideas or results (5)
    - Significant original work and novel results (4)
    - Some interesting ideas and results on a subject already well investigated (3)
    - Minor variations on a subject well investigated (2)
    - Nothing particularly novel (1)
- *Importance of the topic*: rate the importance of the topic addressed in the paper and its timeliness within its area of research.
    - Excellent (5)
    - Above average (4)
    - Average (3)
    - Below average (2)
    - Low (1)
- *Appropriateness of the topic*: how relevant the submission is considering the Call for Papers.
    - Excellent (5)
    - Good (4)
    - Acceptable (3)
    - Little (2)
    - None (1)
- *Scholarly/scientific quality*: Rate (a) the technical content of the paper (completeness of the analysis or simulation study, thoroughness of the work, accuracy of the models, …), (b) the logical coherence and detail of the description of the work and (c) its scientific rigor (statistical analysis of results, comparison with baseline system/state-of-the-art methods, …).
    - Excellent work and outstanding technical content and significant scientific contribution (5)
    - Solid work of notable importance (4)
    - Valid work but limited contribution (3)
    - Marginal work and simple contribution. Some flaws (2)
    - Questionable work with severe flaws (1)
- *Paper organization and readability*: rate the paper organization, the clearness of text and figures and the completeness and accuracy of references.
    - Excellent (5)

- o Well written (4)
- o Readable, but minor revision is needed (3)
- o Substantial revision work is needed. (2)
- o Unacceptable (1)
- Reproducibility of research/open source software and data: rate to what extent the work contributes to open-source software tools/data and reproducible research[1] (enable the reproduction of the results that the authors claim in the paper by others):
  - o The work is reproducible the database is public and the software is open source/free. (5)
  - o The work is reproducible and the authors make the database available to the community (4)
  - o The work is reproducible but either the database is not directly accessible or the software is not open source/free (3)
  - o The code developed by the authors is available but the work is not reproducible because either the data or methods for comparison are not available (2)
  - o Work not reproducible (1)
- *Award*: Do you recommend this paper for the best student/conference paper/poster award?
  - o Yes
  - o No
- *Overall Recommendation*: What is the overall recommendation for this paper?
  - o Accept (5)
  - o Weak accept (4)
  - o Weak reject (3)
  - o Reject (2)
  - o Strong reject (1)

References

The evaluation criteria are based on those used in the ISMIR 2013, ISMIR 2012, WASPAA 2013, IEEE Signal Processing Society reviewing guidelines and guidelines for reproducible research (www.reproducibleresearch.net)

---

[1] www.reproducibleresearch.net