



Unified Jury Reviewer Guidelines

February 2016

THANK YOU...

for volunteering your time in support of
SIGGRAPH 2016.



Submission Formats

The General Submissions jury (aka- Unified Jury) reviews submissions for multiple programs, each with different considerations & acceptance rates:

- Courses
- Emerging Technologies (installations)
- Panels
- Studio (installations)
- Talks
- VR Village (installations)



Submission Formats

Courses:

- Attendees learn from the experts in the field.
- SIGGRAPH seeks to secure a wide variety covering a diverse set of technical and artistic topics.
- Content ranges from entry-level/first-time attendees through more advanced.
- Length of Courses are 1.5 hours (short) or 3.25 hours (long).



Submission Formats

Panels:

- Aim to bring together a range of information, experience, or perspective that attendees could not get any other way (e.g., discussing the “future of rendering”).
- Three important aspects to consider with Panels:
 - An interesting topic
 - An excellent moderator
 - A set of experienced panelists



Submission Formats

Talks:

- Presentation of ideas that are still in progress, or showcase how computer graphics and interactive techniques are actually implemented and used, in graphic production or other fields.
- Talk presentations of either 20 or 40 minutes are combined together for session.



Submission Formats

Installations:

Submission to installations are given the option to select:

- Emerging Technologies
- Studio
- VR Village



Submission Formats

Installations - Emerging Technologies:

- Attendees see, experience, and play with cool new technologies.
- Submissions should be fun, educational, or thought-provoking.

Installations - Studio:

- A space for projects that are hands-on creative activities.
- Past examples include: rapid prototypes from Zbrush, CNC plaster molds from 3D scan data, 3D lenticular prints, laser-etched custom designs moveable paper robots and Raspberry Pi drums.



Submission Formats

Installations - VR Village:

- Highly visible, energetic venue for immersive experiences and real-time demonstrations, creative presentations, and performances.



Reviewer Role

To judge the quality, completeness, novelty and scientific or artistic integrity of the submission.



Reviewer Guidelines

Consider these guidelines when writing fair and objective reviews:

- Provide brief summaries. This helps the onsite Unified Jury in discussions about borderline submissions.
- Ensure that your critique is fair and polite. Don't be rude.
- Critique the submission on its merit, not the author(s).
- Give authors the benefit of doubt.



Reviewer Guidelines

Consider these guidelines when writing fair and objective reviews:

- List some points in favor of the work before going into the questions you might have about the submission.
- Keep your questions about the submission polite.
- Back up your questions with factual detail and avoid emotive language.
- If you have important criticisms of the submission, provide factual detail to help the authors understand your concerns.



Reviewer Guidelines

Consider these guidelines when writing fair and objective reviews:

- Think about how they might improve the submission rather than about how to eliminate the submission.
- Don't make your review personal.
- SIS won't allow submitters to submit incomplete submissions. If you can't find essential files then please double check you downloaded all the materials to review.



Reviewer Guidelines

Consider these guidelines when writing fair and objective reviews:

- Course submissions - - keep in mind that the guidelines only ask for sample course notes. Don't expect full course notes in the submission. For hands on practical courses the emphasis is more on the practical elements so consider the type of course you are reviewing.
- Submitters may submit to multiple formats. Make sure you review the material keeping in mind the submission format.



Reviewer Guidelines

Consider these guidelines when writing fair and objective reviews:

- Before you submit your review, read it through and ask yourself if you were the author, would you find the language in the review insulting? If it would be insulting then temper the review.



Examples of Bad Reviews

Reviewer A *“There is nothing novel in the submission”*

- If you firmly believe that the submission is not novel, ask the submission to clarify how the work contrasts with the work of Joe Bloggs from 2005 that appeared to solve the exact same thing using the exact same algorithm.
- Back up your view with factual questions. You can phrase this fairly neutrally as “it is unclear how the works described in the submission compares with the work of Joe Blogs et al. [2005], which appears to solve this problem using exactly the same algorithm. It would be beneficial for the submission to highlight the differences with this prior work more clearly.”



Examples of Bad Reviews

Reviewer A *“The author’s work is not of interest to the SIGGRAPH community, they should submit to xyz conference instead”*

- Do not say this even if you think the work is completely out of scope for example on comparing and contrasting the amount of a given protein in cows milk and goat’s milk. SIGGRAPH is interested in content spanning a range of areas that fall clearly within Computer Graphics and Interactive Systems. This can also include applications we might think are outside our perceived scope but do use Computer Graphics and interactive systems in a creative way.
- Be open-minded and make constructive comments on how to improve the submission.
- If you really feel strongly about the relevance of the work, to the community, then write something about this in the private comments that submitters don’t see as it may help the onsite committee during the selection process.



Examples of Bad Reviews

Reviewer A *“The authors did not compare their method with the method of Joe Blogs”*

- If you are Joe Blogs and you are “upset” that someone else is stomping in your playground -- stop right there! Ask yourself; can you objectively review the submission? If you feel conflicted, don't review it. Contact us and get the submission re-assigned to someone else.
- If you are able to objectively review the work then be polite and constructive.
- Don't make the review about your work. Point the authors to relevant material, but don't abuse your power to affect something advantageous to yourself. Authors can spot this, and they can usually guess who you are. If your work is very relevant to the submission then other reviewers will also spot the omission.



Examples of Bad Reviews

Reviewer A *“I don’t understand why the authors did this, it seems ill thought out”*

- Statements such as this are personal and overly aggressive.
- Instead, explain which elements of the submission you found hard to follow and why.
- Give constructive detail and keep in mind that you might have potentially misunderstood something about the work, so don’t make it into a personal attack.



Closing Notes

- From time to time, we all get a truly *poor* submission to review. If this happens to you be polite, constructive, and give some helpful advice to the contributors on how to improve their submission.
- If you really need to have a rant about the submission, put it in the private comments field and then suitably temper your visible review.
 - The private comments section is useful to give the onsite committee some insights that you believe might be relevant.
 - However, please ensure that the visible parts of your review are professional.
- Check out the Facebook group “Reviewer 2 must be stopped” it is a goldmine of experience that submitters have had with poor quality reviews. We don’t want any of our reviews to make it on there for discussion!

