REVIEW GUIDELINES FOR EDRA50 CONFERENCE SUBMISSIONS

Title of the abstract

PAPER ID# _____

REVIEWER ID# _____

STUDENT SUBMISSION (YES/NO)

Purpose of this peer review
Feedback is very important. Please make an honest attempt to provide useful feedback that will help authors to improve their abstracts, papers and presentations. In most cases, a few well-targeted comments can lead to a good presentation even when an abstract shows obvious flaws. Only on rare occasions is an abstract so void of substance that it should be rejected out of hand and in such cases a respectful explanation is very important.

We understand that some reviewers may review abstracts on subjects not familiar to them; in this case, please read the abstract as an interested outsider and focus on improving clarity from that point of view. However, if you believe you cannot fairly review the assigned abstract or paper, please contact us at the email below.

Timeline note: If you will not be able to review your assigned submissions, please notify the conference at conference@edra.org as soon as possible so we can assign additional reviewers. It is unfair to authors and your fellow reviewers if the reviews are not provided in time.

If you have a colleague who would be a good reviewer for a submission, please email their contact information to the conference email listed above.

Confidentiality reminder: By acting as a reviewer, you are seeing unpublished works created by others. Your professional ethics require that you do not distribute these, or discuss their contents with anyone other than the track chair.

I. QUALITATIVE ASSESSMENT
Peer reviewers are required to provide comments in each area of the review areas listed in the instructions below. Please note that abstract only submissions may or may not be able to provide enough information to answer items 5, 6, or 7. Provide comments there at your discretion.

1. ABSTRACT: Does the abstract convey the essence of the project/research study? The abstract should tell in a concise manner the purpose of the study and or design project, methods/approaches used, results, and conclusions/reflectons on the project’s success.
2. **RELEVANCE.** In your opinion, does the main point of the abstract contribute new perspectives or new information to the current knowledge in the environmental design fields?

3. **BACKGROUND:** Does the background provide sufficient context to the research study/design project?

4. **PURPOSE/OBJECTIVES:** Is the purpose of the abstract clearly stated?

5. **REVIEW OF LITERATURE AND PRECEDENTS:** Does the author give due credit to relevant contributions of others? Does the author place the contribution in proper perspective in relation to the state of knowledge of the subject? How does it relate to the goals of integrating a human perspective to environmental design? If this is a design project, does the abstract frame the project within the most current discussion and paradigms in the environmental design fields?

6. **METHODS:** If this is a description of a research study, are the methods described clearly? Are the methods used appropriate for the purpose? If this is a design submission, does the abstract include sufficient information regarding the design process and steps taken by the designers to achieve the intended outcomes?

7. **PRESENTATION OF DATA:** If this is a research presentation, are all tables, figures, and images clearly labeled and referred to in the text? In the case of a design-based investigation, is sufficient evidence provided to support the approach taken by the author(s)? If it is a design project, does the abstract provide enough evidence of the unique approach taken in the design?

8. **MEANINGFUL CONTRIBUTION:** Are the main arguments, findings clear? Are the conclusions stated adequately? Are they clearly supported by the data? Is the abstract making a meaningful contribution to our theoretical and practical knowledge of human-centered environmental design?

9. **OVERALL STRUCTURE/CLARITY:** Does the title adequately describe the content of the proposal (or abstract)?

10. **LANGUAGE:** Is the abstract written in a clear manner?

11. **VALUE:** What value does this proposal offer if it were to be presented? Does it provide clarity to present understanding? Does it offer new perspective, issue, or definition of a particular research topic or design approach? Does it offer new information or a new approach to environmental design? Or does it provide a valuable confirmation of present knowledge?
12. FIT: Does the abstract address the relevance of the research/design project to environmental design and EDRA’s mission? (The purpose of EDRA is to disseminate and advance high quality environmental design research on socio-behavioral aspects of people environment relationships by stimulating conversations about scientific and applied research. Thereby, EDRA facilitates the creation of stewardship of environments that are responsive to human needs, improve quality of life, and enhance the meaning of place.)

13. LEARNING OBJECTIVES: Are specific knowledge, skills and abilities that attendees will learn after attending the presentation. Are learning objectives for this paper clearly stated?
   Yes ____ No ______

II. QUANTITATIVE ASSESSMENT
Below, please select your final recommendations to the conference organizing committee. Please select only one option. Each option is associated with a score on a scale from 1-6. Scores between 1 and 2 will warrant rejection from the conference. Scores of 3-5 may require additional edits to be included in the conference.

___ Reject: Content is inappropriate to the conference or has little merit (1 point)
___ Probable Reject: Basic flaws in content or presentation or very poorly written (2 points)
___ Marginal Tend to Reject: Not as badly flawed; the content is well covered in existing literature/or contemporary design practice, but major efforts are necessary to be accepted (3 points)
___ Marginal Tend to Accept: Content has merit, but accuracy, clarity, completeness, and/or writing; content should/could be improved prior to the conference (4 points)
___ Clear Accept: Content, presentation, and writing meet professional norms; improvements may be advisable but acceptable as is (5 points)
___ Must Accept: Excellent proposal of clear value to the EDRA community, without any revisions (6 points)
III. OPEN ENDED COMMENTS TO THE AUTHOR(S) These will be shared with the authors in order to improve on the submission and/or conference presentation/posters etc.

Please describe areas for improvement, indications of particular strengths, and/or any other suggestion that would improve the chances of a successful conference presentation.

___________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________

OPEN ENDED COMMENTS TO THE PROGRAM COMMITTEE These will be used internally only, and will not be shared with the author.

Please provide any additional reasoning for your assessment of this proposal, which will help us determine what to do when reviewers disagree with each other.

___________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________

BEST PAPER CANDIDATE (YES/NO)

Best Papers are accepted full papers showcasing the highest standards in terms of quality of research, written communication, and relevance to EDRA's mission.

BEST POSTER CANDIDATE (YES/NO)

Best Poster Award winner goes to recognize research and projects that respond to human factors at the full range of environmental design scales. Best posters display exceptional depth and rigor in their investigation on the needs of humans in the built and natural environments and succeed in communicating its findings to an audience of professionals, researchers, and academics in the environmental design disciplines.