

## The checklist of review criteria

Please provide a brief summary of the submission including the proposed framework, design novelty, clarity, and interactivity. (maximum 2000 characters)

### 1. Problem statement

**Scoring Guide :** (“What we're looking for”)

Does the submission clearly state a problem and propose to solve it?

- a. **Score of 1 (Weak):** The submission does not take into account a problem, or does not state the goal of the submission well.
- b. **Score of 2 (Needs Improvement):** The submission clearly has potential or credibility, but still fails to state the problem addressed clearly.
- c. **Score of 3 (Neutral):** The submission states the problem, but either addresses a different one or fails to address the problem in a reasonably-significant manner (Note: as this is a new workshop, we'd like to be lenient with the word *significant*)
- d. **Score of 4 (Strong):** The submission sets a very strong example of how to address the problem, which should be relevant to the workshop themes.
- e. **Score of 5 (Exceptional):** The submission states a well-known problem relevant to the workshop, and sets what could be a new standard in the field when it comes to addressing it.

### 2. Reference to the literature

**Scoring Guide:** (“What we're looking for”)

Our workshop is not the first group to tackle the issues discussed here, and we want to ensure submissions are giving enough credit to past works, and how they differentiate from those that have attained before.

- a. **Score of 1 (Weak):** The submission fails to acknowledge or cite previous work.
- b. **Score of 2 (Needs Improvement):** The submission leaves out prominent examples of previous work in the area.
- c. **Score of 3 (Neutral):** The submission acknowledges previous work, but does not necessarily explain how the submission differentiates itself (i.e we want to avoid the “deluge of citation” strategy, leaving the reviewer to click through references and figure this part out themselves).
- d. **Score of 4 (Strong):** The submission directly differentiates itself from previous works and formats.
- e. **Score of 5 (Exceptional):** The submission directly differentiates itself from previous works and formats, and provides enough structure (code, instructions, etc.) for the submission to itself be a new standard.

### 3. Relevance of Submission to Themes of the Workshop (Accessibility & inclusivity, explainability & pedagogy, interpretability & visualization)

**Scoring Guide:** (“What we're looking for”)

Submissions should be addressing a theme of the workshop; the reviewer should ensure that even strong submissions / technical exhibits abide by this subcategory of rating.

- a. **Score of 1 (Weak):** Submission does not attempt to address a theme of the workshop.
- b. **Score of 2 (Needs Improvement):** Submission attempts to address a theme of the workshop, but either misunderstands the theme or only superficially addresses it (i.e brings it up in an introduction, but does not attempt to address it or connect it to the submission)
- c. **Score of 3 (Neutral):** Attempt was clearly made to address a theme of the workshop, but it seems that the work was ‘retrofitted’ to match the theme of the workshop.
- d. **Score of 4 (Strong):** The submission directly addresses a theme of the workshop, and does so in a very professional manner.
- e. **Score of 5 (Exceptional):** Like (4) but does so with multiple themes of the workshop.

### 4. Adherence to Accessibility / Accessibility Statement

**Scoring Guide:** (“What we're looking for”)

Submissions should declare an accessibility statement, define the challenges and limitations faced in improving accessibility, while also acknowledging any known exceptions (i.e. any inaccessible areas). The reviewer should ensure that the submission is supplemented with these accessibility commitments.

- a. **Score of 1 (Weak):** Submission does not commit to improving accessibility.
- b. **Score of 2 (Needs Improvement):** Submission provides an accessibility statement, but does not attempt to address it.
- c. **Score of 3 (Neutral):** Submission proposes methods to improve accessibility, but the level of intended accessibility is not well-articulated. Also, the limitations and exceptions are not stated.
- d. **Score of 4 (Strong):** Submission states accessibility concerns and provides solutions within the proposed framework. However, it does not declare the limitations and exceptions.
- e. **Score of 5 (Exceptional):** Submission identifies and articulates accessibility matters, provides justifications for the proposed paradigm, and declares the limitations.

### 5. Presentation of results

**Scoring Guide:** (“What we're looking for”)

Submissions should provide an appropriate presentation style for the research purpose/question. This includes novelty, clarity, content delivery, interactivity of the framework. The conclusions should be clearly stated. Also, practical significance/theoretical implications should also be discussed where applicable. The reviewer should give the score according to the extent that the above-mentioned criteria have been addressed.

- a. **Score of 1 (Weak):** Submission neither provides coherent content, nor an/a interactive/novel scheme.
- b. **Score of 2 (Needs Improvement):** Submission shows a poor level of clarity, novelty, coherency, and interactivity.
- c. **Score of 3 (Neutral):** Submission is well designed and provides a good level of coherency/novelty/interactivity.
- d. **Score of 4 (Strong):** Submission is very well structured and follows all the criteria (i.e. clarity, novelty, interactivity, and coherency). However, practical significance/theoretical implications are not discussed.
- e. **Score of 5 (Exceptional):** Submission has an excellent design and all criteria are addressed. Conclusions, practical/theoretical implications are well articulated.

6. Does this submission have significant issues that might be grounds for rejection? If yes, please explain.

7. Overall Recommendation (SR, WR, WA, SA)

**Scoring Guide:** ("What we're looking for")

Note that since this is a first-time workshop, we would like to be lenient with acceptance criteria. We would also like to explicitly welcome adversarial perspectives.

- a. **Strong Reject:** The reviewer observed significant issues in the submission.
- b. **Weak Reject:** The reviewer believes the submission discusses important matters but it lacks clarity and design structure.
- c. **Weak Accept:** The reviewer believes the submission provides a novel and reliable scheme to improve science communication but needs improvement.
- d. **Strong Accept:** The reviewer has a strong enthusiasm to apply the proposed framework in her/his work.

8. On a scale of 1-5, how confident are you in the provided judgment?  
Please provide a one or two sentence justification for your confidence ranking (Note that 5 denotes a great level of confidence and 1 indicates the least).