FOCAPD Peer Review Policy

The Foundations of Computer Aided Chemical Engineering 2024 Conference uses the following peer-review system.

Terminology

We use the following terminology:

- <u>Conference paper</u>: This is a 5-8 page research paper (as determined by the publisher's template and formatting requirements) describing an **original** research contribution and published in the conference proceedings.

- <u>Extended Abstract:</u> This is an optional original paper of unspecified length that is contributed by an invited speaker.

- <u>Abstract:</u> This refers to the short (usually 250 word or less) abstract that describes the topic that will be presented at the conference, either orally or in poster form. When a corresponding conference paper or extended abstract has been provided, this is usually the normal abstract contained within that work.

- <u>One-Page Abstract:</u> This is a one-page abstract (as determined by the publisher's template and formatting requirements) that is first submitted by a potential contributing author in response to the open call. It is used for contribution screening and is not published.

Application

All contributing authors are required to submit a conference paper as a condition of presentation at the conference.

A contributing author may only present at the poster session if the corresponding conference paper has passed peer review and is accepted by the conference chairs.

Invited speakers may optionally submit a conference paper, an extended abstract, or neither.

All conference papers are subject to peer review.

Extended abstracts are not subject to peer review.

Publications

All conference papers which have passed peer review and have been accepted by the conference chairs will be published in the conference proceedings. All extended abstracts which have been accepted by the conference chairs will be published in the conference proceedings.

The conference proceedings will clearly identify which publications are conference papers and which are extended abstracts, and therefore, whether or not they were subject to peer review.

Limits

A presenter may present at most one poster at a conference. For multi-authored works, the same individual can be on multiple contributions; however, that person may only present one poster. Those posters must be presented by some other author.

Peer Review Process

Initial Screening

The conference chairs will screen the initial submissions (one-page abstracts) of contributed papers. At their option, chairs may choose to reject these submissions for any reason, but the primary reasons for rejection at this stage are (a) subject does not match conference themes and topics; (b) in appropriate, unprofessional, unethical, or dishonest material; (c) duplicate submissions; (d) abandoned submissions; (e) multiple submissions from same presenter; (f) obvious poor quality; (g) reasonable suspicion of machine-generated text; (h) need to limit acceptances because of conference space constraints. Chairs may also transfer papers between sessions at this stage.

Conference chairs will then invite authors of the one-page abstracts that have passed the initial screening to submit a 5-8 page conference paper for peer review.

Conference Paper Peer Review

Conference chairs act as editors. They will assign peer reviewers to assess the quality of the conference papers and manage the peer review process for each paper. Peer reviewers are generally selected from the International Scientific Committee who are scientists, engineers, or researchers with technical expertise in the conference topic. Peer reviewers must be considered technical experts in their field, hold a PhD, and have published peer reviewed scientific works previously. Each work must be reviewed by a minimum of two peer-reviewers.

A "single-blind" peer review system is used, in which the peer reviewers have access to the identities of the authors, but the authors are never given the identities of the peer reviewers. This is consistent with most journal peer-review procedures in our field.

Peer reviewers will be given a set of quality criteria that may include scientific and technical quality, quality of writing, originality and novelty, appropriateness for the conference topic and theme, interest to the community, and other factors of merit. Peer reviewers are expected to be rigorous and critical in their technical assessments and adhere to the highest standards in the field in order to ensure high quality. Peer reviewers are asked to comment on their assigned conference papers and issue a recommendation to the conference chairs based on this quality criteria. Reviewers may recommend one of the following:

Accept Paper

No technical changes are necessary before publication. Only typographical, spelling, grammar, or other minor changes are necessary which do not require technical review.

Accept Paper with Minor Revisions

Some minor technical issues need to be addressed either through technical changes to the manuscript or through rebuttal to reviewer comments. The reviewer does not believe the issues are significant enough to require additional technical review by the reviewers. The reviewer has provided enough commentary such that the editor can decide if the minor issues have been addressed in a future revision.

Revise Paper with Re-Review

Major technical issues need to be addressed either through technical changes to the manuscript or through rebuttal to reviewer comments. The reviewer believes the issues are significant enough to require that the revised manuscript receive additional review by the reviewers.

Reject Without Reconsideration

The technical issues are so significant that it is unlikely that an acceptable manuscript could be produced by the deadline; or, the manuscript is out of scope, inappropriate, or computer-generated.

Peer reviewers may be asked to provide numerical scores or rankings, as well as provide written comments intended for the chairs and/or the authors. Peer reviewers are encouraged to provide specific and constructive feedback that will aid the authors in improving the work and provide advice to the chairs.

The conference chairs are responsible for making the final decision on each paper and may require several rounds of author changes if necessary to meet quality standards. Conference chairs are not required to follow the recommendations of the peer reviewers in making these decisions. It is possible that conference chairs will choose to not accept some papers that still pass through rigorous technical peer review, especially when limited by available space or when papers do not sufficiently promote conference objectives. Conference chairs may also transfer papers between sessions as desired.

Conflicts of Interest and Ethical Guidelines

The chairs and peer reviewers must ensure they do not have a conflict of interest that may bias their decisions, such as ensuring that authors are at "arm's length" and have no financial conflicts of interest. Peer reviewers and chairs must disclose if they have such a conflict of interest with a specific submission, and if so, a different chair and/or peer reviewer should be assigned to handle that submission.

To help determine conflicts of interest, and for all other ethical guidelines, we use the *Systems and Control Transactions* ethical guidelines described at: https://psecommunity.org/contributor-guidelines