Guidelines for EDM 2023 PC Members

We are committed to setting a high standard of quality and integrity for the EDM2023 review process. There are two main goals in reviewing:
- To decide fairly whether each paper is worthy of acceptance; and
- To provide the authors with feedback on how to improve the quality of their research and writing.

With these goals in mind, we request that all reviewers follow the review guidelines below (based loosely on the ICLR 2020, EDM 2022, and LAK conference guidelines).

Reviews should include:

- A total of 200-500 words of detailed feedback that give a complete and rationaled assessment of a submission (the kind you would like to receive for your own work). Please avoid very short reviews, they are frustrating for authors and detrimental to the overall review process.

- The review should include:
    - A brief summary of the paper itself (e.g., the question being addressed, the high level approach utilised, what was found).
    - A thorough assessment of the submission's main strengths and weaknesses in making a substantial conceptual, technical or empirical contribution to educational data mining
    - Where possible, suggestions for improvement should be given

- Please pay attention to questions related to **fairness, equity, and positive social impacts** of the paper. The review form explicitly lists a few questions related to these topics, please make sure to answer them as applicable.

- The following categories and questions are useful to consider in writing your review:
    - **Relevance:**
        - Is the submission trying to solve an important educational problem, which is interesting and relevant for the educational data mining community?
        - Does the submission attend to the real-world context, including issues of impact, fairness and equity?
    - **Novelty:**
        - Is there a novel contribution in the submission in relation to previous work in the area?
        - If a replication study is reported, is it clear what is the contribution to knowledge in comparison to the original study?
    - **Grounding:**
        - Is the work situated appropriately with respect to the current state of the field, including sufficient coverage of relevant literature?

- **Methods:**
  - Are the methods used suitable, well-described and justified with reference to the literature?
  - Does the submission show accepted evidence of rigour in the tradition followed (statistical, computational, qualitative, design)?
- **Results:**
  - Do the claims made have appropriate empirical support?
  - If negative results are presented, have different explanations for the lack of findings been considered?
- **Implications**
  - Are contributions to theory and/or practice outlined clearly?
  - Are limitations with respect to data, analysis or framing factors taken into account?
  - Are potential issues of fairness and equity considered?
- **Communication:**
  - Is the submission written clearly for understanding by an interdisciplinary audience?

Numeric Assessment
- In addition to the textual review, you should provide two numeric assessments of each submission that align with the textual comments you have made:
  - A 7-point scale numeric ranking {-3 to 3} indicative of the overall evaluation of the quality of the paper that must be supported by your written appraisal
  - A 5-point scale numeric ranking {1 to 5} indicative of your confidence in assessing work in the area addressed by the paper

Additional Considerations

1. If the paper is not properly blinded (i.e., the identity of the authors is revealed in the paper) please review the paper as usual, but **indicate this in the "Confidential remarks for the program committee" box** on the reviewing form.

2. If there are issues with the English in the submission (e.g. grammatical mistakes, misspellings or unusual phrasings), this can be noted in the "Confidential remarks for the program committee" box on the reviewing form, but **it should not affect the review and assessment of the submissions with respect to its scientific merit**.

3. Meta-reviewers will compare all reviews and numeric assessments of quality and confidence as well as author rebuttals (if made) and make final recommendations for paper acceptance or rejection with justification to the program committee chairs.