Reviewer Guidelines

Dear Reviewer,

Thank you for accepting to review the papers of this conference. Our utmost preference is the quality of the paper. As a reviewer, your contribution is very much essential to accept high-quality papers. Following are the review guidelines decided by the IUCEE Foundation and the Program Committee (PC) of ICTIEE 2022. Please adhere to them in reviewing the assigned research papers.

1. Before entering your bid for review, please read the abstract to determine if the manuscript you are opting to review matches your expertise.
2. During the bidding process select the "**Yes**" option to a paper you are willing to review. **Do not select** the "**No**" or "**Maybe**" option for any other papers. Make sure that you will have sufficient time to complete the review. We expect the review process to be completed in 3-4 weeks.
3. The paper has already undergone a similarity index check in anti-plagiarism software. You can start the review directly. Checking the paper organization as per the JEET template is our responsibility.
4. We follow purely a **double-blind** review process where the reviewer details are unknown to the authors and vice-versa. Reviewers must have no personal, nor professional conflict of interest with the authors and must not try to hold the publication, unless the content of the paper is proved incorrect. Every negative criticism must only be substantiated by sound scientific arguments.
5. Reviewers are not allowed to share by any means the content of the paper that they have accepted to review, nor use its content (even partially) for their purposes.
6. Since the papers are assigned to you based on your interest, try to ask as many questions as possible in case the explanation in the paper is not clear or confuses you.
7. Irrespective of whether the paper gets accepted or rejected, please write **proper comments**. It is **not advisable** to leave the comments section blank even if the paper gets rejected. Let's try to give fair comments so that the researcher can implement them, improve the quality of the work and resubmit to another conference. The reviewer has to write in 3~5 sentences what he understands about the aim, methodology, results of the paper, and **justification** for **accept/reject decision**. We should provide a fair appreciation for the content of the paper, and also give some recommendations for its improvement wherever possible.
8. Ensure that paper matches the **theme** of the conference – "**Engineering Education and Research**". Make sure that the comments are about the technical contributions of the paper not only about the formatting. The comments given should be in line with your decisions.
9. There will be two sections to write your reviews – comments to Chairs of PC and comments to authors. Your decision related information shall be written in the first section and consolidated review details shall in the comments to authors. The author can see only the comments and the Chairs of PC can see both.

Reviewer Guidelines

Specific Review guidelines for JEET:

As the selected papers from the ICTIEE 2022 will be published in **Journal of Engineering Education Transformations (JEET)**, we expect you to follow the review guidelines given by the Editorial Committee of Journal during the review process. The Guidelines for the publication of articles in JEET are as follows:

The Journal of Engineering Education Transformations (JEET) is a forum to facilitate conversations among engineering educators who would like to showcase their transformational work as publications reviewed by expert educators and education researchers from across the world. JEET publishes papers that contribute to Engineering Education Research (EER). Engineering education research is a field of inquiry that adopts a scholarly approach to the education of engineers. As a result, EER reports on studies that contribute to ongoing conversations that influence the education of engineers and the role of educators and institutions in this process.

As a reviewer, you shall be invited to review manuscripts in the following categories:

- Practice Papers
  - o Practice papers report on an intervention that is considered best practice and could be valuable to other engineering education practitioners and researchers. For best practice papers, a reviewer shall focus one the clear problem description, details of intervention, measures of effectiveness and reliability and validity of the evidences.
- Research Papers
  - o The purpose of research papers is to contribute to an ongoing conversation in engineering education research literature. For best research papers, the reviewer shall focus upon alignment of gap in the literature, clear research questions, validity and analysis methods of the data, claims or conclusions strongly supported by evidences.

Quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methods research designs are accepted.

Review Criteria

When submitting your review of the manuscript, you will be asked to provide feedback to the using the following criteria:

1. Contribution

Consider what is novel about the study, its contribution, and if it is valuable to other engineering education practitioners and researchers.

- ✓ For practice papers: What can the readership take away from the study for use in their own practice?
- ✓ For research papers: How does the study contribute to ongoing conversations in engineering education research and/or practice?

2. Contextualization

Reviewer Guidelines

Consider how the study has been grounded in theory and has been integrated into the existing literature.

- ✓ For practice papers: Does the study relate to what has already been written in the field?
- ✓ For research papers: Are the purpose, limitations, and implications of the study discussed in relation to engineering education research and/or practice?

3. Scientific Rigor

Consider how well designed and executed the study is and the extent to which the findings/results are valid.

- ✓ For practice papers: Is the research method/approach, used to determine the intervention's effectiveness, appropriate for the study and adequately described? Are the arguments employed valid and supported by the evidence presented?
- ✓ For research papers: Is the research method informed by theory, aligned to the study purpose, and clearly articulated? Are the arguments employed valid and supported by the evidence presented?

4. Clarity and Quality

Is the submission well organized? Is the problem, purpose, research objectives sufficiently motivated? Is it clearly structured, easy to read, and with a logical flow of thought?

Is the quality and clarity of writing of an acceptable standard? Is the readability affected by grammar, spelling, and punctuation? Are all figures and illustrations relevant, and do they enhance the overall message? Is the work of authors referenced appropriately?