

Published Rules for ICIDS review process

These rules are provided by the ICIDS Steering Committee to help guide the Organizing Committee (General Chairs and Program Chairs) of a given year's conference in the running of the technical program.

1. The reviewing committee consists of 2 Program Chairs (PCs), Associate Chairs (ACs) invited by the PCs to oversee specific tracks, and a Program Committee of invited reviewers.
2. All reviewers, including chairs, are required to declare conflicts of interest. One reason for dual chairs is that chairs can submit work, too, but then the reviewing process for that work is headed by the other chair.
3. Each paper will receive a **minimum of three reviews**, plus a meta review provided by an AC. The purpose of the meta review is to synthesize the other three reviews.
4. Each reviewer assesses each paper on a scale established by the Program Chairs. They also provide written feedback.
5. The AC or the Program Chairs will solicit additional reviews in ambiguous cases.
6. The process may include a rebuttal phase. If so, authors may use the rebuttal to clarify their points, and propose improvements. Rebuttals are assessed by AC in their role as meta reviewers, and passed along to the Program Chairs for the final decision.
7. The results of the review process are communicated to the authors. Results may be Accepted or Rejected.
8. Rejected papers are to be considered for another category at the discretion of the Program Chairs and General Chairs. The normal process is that Long Papers can become Short Papers and Short Papers can become Posters; however, Long Papers becoming Posters is also a possibility.
9. An Ombudsperson (a member of the Steering Committee) exists, who can be contacted by submission authors and who can (together with the Steering Committee) overrule decisions and mediate in case of issues. This process is only available if all other procedures have been exhausted and is thus understood to be reserved for emergencies only.
10. The Ombudsperson is there **to investigate cases in which the published rules of the review process have not been followed**. They will not respond to complaints about review results if proper procedures have been followed.