

Reviewing Process for the ISPRS Congress 2016, Prague

Guidelines for Working Group Officers and Technical Commission Presidents

Types of submissions, publications and sessions

Authors can submit a full paper or an abstract for review. Papers accepted on the basis of a full paper review will be published in the ISPRS Annals¹. If a full paper is rejected for publication in the ISPRS Annals, it may still be accepted for publication in the ISPRS Archives. Papers accepted on the basis of an abstract review will be published in the ISPRS Archives².

Upon submission of their full paper or abstract authors will select the session they consider most suitable for their paper. This serves as a first way to direct the papers to the officers that will handle the review process. As with the previous congresses, there are three session types:

- **Technical sessions:** the fields of these sessions correspond to the working group fields. Papers submitted to technical sessions will be dealt with by the Working Group (WG) officers and Technical Commission Presidents (TCPs).
- **Thematic sessions:** these sessions have been defined to attract additional papers on topics to be highlighted. The TCPs have been asked some time ago to provide these topics. For each thematic session there is a chair who will take on the same role as the WG officers for the technical sessions. Every thematic session is linked to a technical commission and, hence, to a TCP who will oversee the review process for this thematic session.
- **Special sessions:** these sessions are organised by Council in cooperation with sister societies of the ISPRS. Council is handling the review process for these papers.

Review of full papers

In short: the WG officers are responsible for assigning reviewers and collecting the reviews for papers assigned to their session and for making a preliminary decision. The WG officers do not make reviews themselves, but act as area chairs. I.e., they make their decision based on the collected reviews and their own opinion on the quality of a paper. In this decision making the WG officers can ignore reviews of a poor quality (e.g. missing motivation for negative assessments) and are asked to take position if reviewers expressed contradicting views on the quality of a paper. The TCPs check the preliminary decisions of the WG officers and make the final decision. The software ConfTool will be used for the handling of all communication and decisions. More in detail, the tasks are as follows:

Initial checks

- Some authors may have selected a wrong session. Therefore, WG officers check if the paper topic is appropriate for the session. If not, they use the Online Forum in ConfTool to request the TCP to reassign the paper. If the TCP considers the paper inappropriate for his TC, he/she can ask the local programme committee to assign the paper to another TC.
- WG officers check whether the paper is anonymised (see the [author guide lines](#), section 1.1). If the paper is not anonymous, they ask the author to upload an anonymised version.

¹ Full name: The ISPRS Annals of the Photogrammetry, Remote Sensing and Spatial Information Sciences. The ISPRS Annals is the series of proceedings for publications accepted after a full paper double-blind peer review.

² Full name: The International Archives of the Photogrammetry, Remote Sensing and Spatial Information Sciences. The ISPRS Archives is the series of proceedings for publications accepted after abstract review. Both the Archives and Annals are published under the Creative Common Attribution 3.0 License (http://publications.copernicus.org/for_authors/license_and_copyright.html). Both are listed in the ISI Conference Proceedings Citation Index (CPCI) of the Web of Science, SCOPUS, and DOAJ.

- WG officers coarsely check whether the paper was edited based on the ISPRS template or not and are readable (corrupted PDFs). If the paper is not readable or obviously not correctly prepared (e.g. one-column formatted, wrong reference style, overlength – full paper over 8 pages, invited full paper over 12 pages) they ask the author to upload a correct version in time.
- WG officers inform LPC who was invited to submit the invited paper in their Technical Session
- To avoid a conflict of interest, papers submitted by WG officers to their own sessions will be reassigned by the TCP to another session for the reviewing phase. After acceptance of a paper, the paper can still be presented in the session selected during the paper submission.

Reviewing process

- The TCP decides whether two or three reviewers should be invited per paper.
- The WG officers assign the reviewers for every paper. WG officers do not review the papers of their session themselves, but act as area chairs (see above). Area chairs are supposed to read the papers on which they need to make a preliminary decision. If the number of papers in a session is more than 10, the WG officers can ask the TCP to appoint additional area chairs and reassign part of the papers to them.
- TCPs request the local organisers to open the review phase for their TC and send out the review requests to the reviewers.
- WG officers monitor the reviewing progress and timely invite additional reviewers if reviews are expected to be late or unavailable.
- If a submitted review has a very low quality, WG officers can invite additional reviewers.
- WG officers can be reviewer for papers of other WGs, but should consider whether they can complete the reviews in time next to the work for their own WG.
- Similarly, TCP do not review papers submitted to their own TC, but may review papers submitted to other TCs.

Decisions

- The area chairs (either WG officers or the additionally appointed area chairs) discuss each paper and make their decision based on the collected reviews and their own opinion on the quality of a paper. In this decision making the WG officers can ignore reviews of a poor quality and are asked to take position if reviewers expressed contradicting views on the quality of a paper.
- Possible decisions are Accept for Annals, Accept for Archives, and Reject. Whether an accepted paper will be presented in an oral or poster session is decided later.
- The TCPs, together with the other members of the International Program Committee belonging to their TC, check the preliminary decisions of the WG officers and make the final decisions.
- To avoid conflict of interest, the chair and vice-chairs of the International Programme Committee make the final decision on papers with TCP (co-)authorship.
- TCP's request the local organisers to communicate the decisions to the authors.

Deadlines

The following deadlines apply to the full paper review process:

13 th December 2015	Full Paper submission deadline
18 th December 2015	All initial checks done by WG officers and reviewers assigned to all full papers
5 th January 2016	TCPs have all assignments checked and request the local organisers to open the review phase for their TC and send out the review requests to the reviewers.
31 st January 2016	Reviews completed
10 th February 2016	Preliminary decision by WG officers and additional area chairs

18 th February 2016	Final Decision by TCPs, together with the other members of the International Program Committee belonging to their TC
21 st February 2016	Author notification on acceptance
10 th March 2016	Author notification on paper location in programme (oral or interactive session)
9 th April 2016	Final paper delivery
14 th April 2016	Early Bird registration fee payment for the paper to be included in the ISPRS Annals or Archives
30 th April 2016	Preliminary programme

Review of abstracts

In short: the WG officers review abstracts themselves and make preliminary decisions. The TCPs check the preliminary decisions of the WG officers and make the final decision. The software ConfTool will be used for the handling of all communication and decisions. More in detail, the tasks are as follows:

Initial checks

- Some authors may have selected a wrong session. Therefore, WG officers check if the abstract topic is appropriate for the session. If not, they use the Online Forum in ConfTool to request the TCP to reassign the abstract. If the TCP considers the abstract topic inappropriate for his TC, he/she can ask the local programme committee to assign the abstract to another TC.
- To avoid a conflict of interest, abstracts submitted by WG officers to their own sessions will be reassigned by the TCP to another session for the reviewing phase. After acceptance of an abstract, the final paper (to be submitted later) can still be presented in the session selected during the abstract submission.

Reviewing process

- Abstracts are reviewed by two WG officers.
- The WG chair assigns abstracts to himself/herself and/or one or two of his WG co-chairs for reviewing.

Decisions

- The WG officers make the decisions based on their reviews.
- Possible decisions are Accept for Archives and Reject. Whether an accepted abstract will be presented in an oral or poster session is decided later.
- The TCPs, together with the other members of the International Program Committee belonging to their TC, check the preliminary decisions of the WG officers and make the final decisions.
- To avoid conflict of interest, the chair and vice-chairs of the International Programme Committee make the final decision on abstracts with TCP (co-)authorship.
- TCP's request the local organisers to communicate the decisions to the authors.

Deadlines

The following deadlines apply to the abstract review process:

13 th December 2016	Abstract submission deadline
5 th January 2016	All initial checks done by WG officers
10 th January 2016	TCPs check
31 st January 2016	Reviews completed
10 th February 2016	Preliminary decision by WG officers
18 th February 2016	Final Decision by TCPs, together with the other members of the International Program Committee belonging to their TC
21 st February 2016	Author notification on acceptance

10 th March 2016	Author notification on paper location in programme (oral or interactive session)
9 th April 2016	Final paper delivery
14 ^h April 2016	Early Bird registration fee payment for the paper to be included in the ISPRS Archives
30 th April 2016	Preliminary programme



Lena Halounová, Congress Director