CN Reviewer’s guidelines

The English paper reviews are threefold of peer-to-peer type. Reviews are blind by default. Authors are requested for blind submissions.

General Approach:
The main goal is to accept only good papers. We expect objective and accurate reviews. Papers with low quality should be rejected. However, please take a balanced approach when reading papers. On the one hand it is important to be thorough, on the other hand, we want a varied and interesting program, so please do not be picky. You were invited to the committee because you are a leader in your field. You probably received papers which are not up to your personal standards. However, some of them may still have technical merits, and could be interesting to others. Please try to keep an open mind. Don't worry about recommending too many papers. If you think a paper will be interesting to attendees, than recommend it. There are several detailed categories of assessment and one final suggestion. When submitting your review, please score the paper on a scale of 0 - 5 as the directions below. It is considered as final assessment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>pt</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Suggestion</th>
<th>Practical meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Outstanding</td>
<td>Paper is accepted if the 2nd and 3rd opinions are above 0 and the sum of all is above the acceptance level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>Strong Accept</td>
<td>If the sum is below the acceptance level then the fourth reviewer is appointed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Weak Accept</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Weak Rejection</td>
<td>Paper is accepted if the 2nd and 3rd opinion are above 0 and the sum of all is above the acceptance level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Very Poor</td>
<td>Postulate Rejection</td>
<td>Paper is accepted if the two other opinions are above 0 and the sum of both is above the acceptance level.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The given paper can receive maximum 15 points. The best three from all reviews are taken into consideration. Depends on this scoring the presentation time is assigned. The acceptance level is estimated each year based on a general level of submitted papers. In 2017 the acceptance rate is below 45%. Thus, the acceptance level is approx. 10 points.

Detailed scoring:
When detailed scoring the content we expect answers and estimations of the following criteria:
1. Title correctness
   Please assess the consistency of the title and content of the paper.
   Does the title is consistent to the paper content?

2. Track
   Please select the track suitable for of the given paper. This is suggestion to the track assignment, possibly being parallel.

3. Area assignment
   Please select the topic area of the paper. This is suggestion to the session assignment within the given track.

4. Authors’ knowledge level
   This is opinion about Author's competence, knowledge and understanding of the described discipline.
   Take into consideration the state-of-the-art & previous works description, and citations of an others work, if any.

5. References
   Please rate the references. Take into consideration the attached references whether they are relevant and sufficient. We prefer references from journals, books and conferences. The Web sources should be removed, except special cases. It is very important to estimate if authors are familiarized with current state of the art.

6. Genuineness and originality
Please judge the genuineness and originality of the paper. Consider if the paper is not a plagiarism or auto-plagiarism. If you have any suspicion let us know.

7. Novelty level
Please consider if the presented methods and results are new

8. Content-related correctness
Please enter a concise opinion about content-related correctness and summarize the main contribution. Consider whether the used terminology and technical language is correct and complies with applicable standards.

9. Technical correctness
Please make a concise opinion about technical correctness according to general rules and required template. How do you rate the presentation (language, style, grammar, typos, figures, formulas, etc.) and the organization of the paper?

10. Paper weakness (if exists)
Please enter the main reasons to reject the paper.

11. Final assessment
It is described above.

12. Best Paper Award
Please consider if the paper is good enough for a reward.

13. Post-conference
Please decide if the paper is good enough for post-conference publication in journal.

14. Corrected version is required
The corrected version will be requested.
If you select this option a corrected file will be automatically sent to you via e-mail (depends on your personal profile set).
Otherwise, the paper will not be requested to be corrected.

15. An review reply is required
The Authors' reply will be requested.
If you select this option, information about author's reply will be automatically sent to you via e-mail.
Otherwise, authors won't be requested for reply to your review

16. Re-review acceptance
Please select if you are going to re-review the paper after the changes.
We strongly encourage to agree for this option. It is extremely valuable for the Authors.
We kindly request to do a re-review as soon as possible.

17. Comments to authors of the paper
Please justify your decision.
Please enter how Authors can improve the manuscript.
Please provide constructive comments.

18. Comments dedicated only to Conference Committee
This field is not visible to Authors and it is dedicated to Committees only.

When considering a manuscript, please pay special attention to the following items:
• Does the paper content is substantively correct?
• Does the paper contain an original contribution to the field?
• Does the paper clearly reference the work of others?
• Does the paper contain the valid references and up to date?
• Is the paper significantly different from previous papers by the author(s)?
• Is the paper technically sound?
• Is the abstract a clear description of the paper?
• Is the paper well written?
  (take question of the proper language up)
  (take into consideration the form, however without exaggeration. The form should be well-
  matched to requested template of Springer LNCS/CCIS series. The form is checked by our
  technical editor in details)
• Does the paper contain a description of non-text objects?
  (tables, figures, axes, pictures, abbreviations, terms, etc.)
• Are the equations and figures clear?
  (picture quality and clearness and formula correctness)

Secondary Reviewers:
You may ask others for assistance, if you want. However, after the secondary reviewer is finished, please
rewrite the review in your own words, and adjust the scores accordingly. You should be able to convincingly
represent the opinions as your own, and not those of the secondary reviewer.

Indecisive scoring:
When filling in your review, try not to be incrementally indecisive (i.e., by scoring most papers in the middle
of the range).
Please don't equivocate. Take a stand. Either you like a paper or you don't.

Editing:
Electronic reviews can be edited. A previously completed review can be updated at any time, until the final
decision is made.

Disclosure:
The review is automatically sent to Authors without the name of the reviewer. However, the reviewer can set
preferences referring to e-mail presentation and direct dialogs.

Reply requests:
The reviewer can request an answer in the form of:
  • Comments
  • Corrected version
If the reviewer requests a reply from the Authors, the paper is given a suspended status until a reply is made.
Please notice that we have to wait for your re-review of the corrected paper which was requested. Thus, please
verify the updated files ASAP.

Attachments:
The reviewer can send a document to Authors as a file via the eConf web system. So, you can prepare
comments within a file (e.g., a paper document: pdf) and pass it to Authors via web page. If you want to stay
anonymous please remember to remove any personal data from comments.

Distinctions:
Please notify us¹ if you think that the given paper should be awarded. There are one best paper award and up
to four distinctions.

Deadlines:
We are asking you to meet the deadlines.

¹ An appropriate field within the review form via eConf web system.
Successive series of articles are sent no more often than once a week. The review of the series should be done during two weeks. Any delay is very undesirable because of the editing process. The total time for the whole review process is about 6 weeks. Please notice that if you assign the rejected status, there is a possibility that we will have to appoint the third reviewer. This process is time-consuming, so please do not linger with the final assessment.