WAM 2027: Submission Review Guidelines

You may download this document to have it on hand as a reference as you complete your reviews. Alternatively, it is available in the review portal under 'WAM 2027 Reviewer Resources' (located in the index on the left).

Thank you in advance! As a reviewer for the WAM 2027 conference, you are a major contributor to the impact that WAM aims to make. Your assessments are crucial to the track chairs' and program chair's decision-making as to what is ready for discussion at the conference. Also – and just as important – they help authors develop their thinking into something that advances the thinking of us all.

You will need to provide a numerical score to rate each submission, selecting from 1 to 5, with 5 being the best.

Also, for each review, you are requested to complete two fields/boxes: one for **Comments to Authors**, the other for **Comments to Lead Reviewers** (Track Chairs). We invite you to submit comments in both, but the comments to the Track Chairs are required for a submitted review and will be used along with your numerical scoring to make decisions about the submissions. Your Comments to Authors will be conveyed to authors, **without identification of the reviewer**. Track Chairs will also have access to your comments to the authors.

Please note that any manuscript, part thereof, or other material you have been assigned to review for WAM 2027 must not be entered into a generative AI tool such as ChatGPT, Claude, etc. This protects the authors' confidentiality along with their rights. This expectation for WAM reviewers is consistent with the policy of major publishers (e.g., *https://www.apa.org/pubs/journals/resources/ai-peer-reviewers*).

For your comments to authors (blind review):

- You can be concise. Two or three hundred words or so will normally be sufficient.
- Please keep the tone of your comments constructive and positive. Be respectful, even of positions or arguments you may find widely departing from your own standards.
- Also, make sure to respectfully point out key issues and problems, and to provide suggestions that would help advancing the work.
- In both positive and critical comments, please be as specific as you can. Put yourself in the place of the authors, and ask what you could hear that would help you advance this piece, or – putting it gently – consider whether this is an idea to reconsider.
- If you think there are problems that can't be fixed, try to offer constructive suggestions as to how the authors might improve the work for future development.
- The more specific your comments are, the more they will help the authors, and the decision process. Where appropriate, refer to specific pages, tables, figures, etc.

• Bear in mind that WAM participants will bring different disciplinary backgrounds, theoretical perspectives and methodological commitments to the discussion, and allow for those as appropriate in your evaluation.
• Nothing in the system will identify you as the reviewer. To preserve the integrity of the blind review process, please make sure that **nothing in your comments identifies you as the reviewer**.

For comments to Track Chairs:

• Your comments for Track Chairs should be placed in the 'Comments to Lead Reviewers' field.
• Add any comments you think are important for the Track Chair to make an evaluation in addition to the comments to authors. **Be certain that nothing in your comments identifies you as the reviewer.**

Submission Specific Guidelines:

Traditional Papers

Review these as you would a submission for publication in a scholarly journal. To be recommended for conference presentation, the submission should be at the level that would qualify it for at least some form of generous revise and resubmit. Comment on the interest and relevance of the topic, the theoretical development, the quality and correctness of any data and analysis, as well as the theoretical and practical implications of the paper.

Developmental Papers

• Developmental papers should not be reviewed in the same way as traditional papers. Because they are only 2,000 to 3,000 words in length, and based on ideas still under development, they are not expected to have the level of completeness and coverage that would be looked for in a traditional paper.
• There are three categories of developmental papers.
    o Research proposals should include research questions or hypotheses, a brief summary of the literature that has informed the questions, and proposed methods for data collection and analysis.
    o Empirical papers should include the elements of a research proposal plus some preliminary analysis.
    o Conceptual papers should identify a conceptual issue, describe the literature relevant to exploring the issue, and outline some preliminary ideas for theoretical contribution to the issue.
• Please review developmental papers relative to the requirements of their category.
    o Is it clear what the authors are proposing to do?
    o Have they addressed the items identified in their category as listed above?
• Note that developmental papers are not presented in the way that traditional papers are. Instead, they are assigned to small groups, in which the participants read each other's papers and the group then discusses the ideas that have emerged.
• It follows that the most important question to ask of a developmental paper is: Does the proposal have the potential to generate an interesting and useful discussion?

Symposia, Panels and Workshops

- Does the proposal reflect the overall quality a WAM audience would expect?
- Would the session be of interest to a reasonable number of conference participants?
- Does the proposal offer sufficient innovation and contribution to warrant program space?
- Does the proposal have clearly stated goals, intended outcomes, and benefits for participants?
- Does the proposed time allocation seem adequate for the proposed topics or activities to be covered?
- In all cases, please explain not only how you feel about the proposal but the reasons for your assessment