

## Some suggestions from the Program Chairs that made a paper suitable for RecSys

- Why the addressed problem is relevant for the RecSys Community.
- Main contributions and their impact are clearly stated: “[A Guide to Writing the NeurIPS Impact Statement](#)” provides non-binding guidance on some of the kinds of things authors may wish to consider.
- Research questions are clearly formulated, claims are properly scoped and supported by experimental results (if applicable).
- Design choices are justified compared with alternative options and other SOTA solutions.
- Evaluation aligned with the aim of the investigation and research questions.
- We always encourage authors to present reproducible scientific results and we strongly believe this is an attitude we should foster in our RecSys community. To promote a fair evaluation of new algorithms and approaches with state-of-the-art baselines and allow other researchers to reproduce the results presented in RecSys papers, we suggest the authors refer to one of the frameworks listed in <https://github.com/ACMRecSys/recsys-evaluation-frameworks>. As for the datasets to use in experimental evaluations, authors may refer to the repositories available at <https://github.com/ACMRecSys/recsys-datasets>.
- We encourage authors to consider further ethical implications and broader impacts of their work, and to discuss these in an appropriate section of their papers.