

# A FICTITIOUS STUDY ON HOW TO HAVE YOUR ICSS 2026 PAPER ACCEPTED

Joseph Sport<sup>1</sup> and Mary Skiing<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Institute for Applied Sports, University of Skiing, City, Country

<sup>2</sup>Mary's Institute of Mechanics, Mary's University, City, Country

**KEY WORDS:** strength training, ground reaction forces, gliding

**INTRODUCTION:** The Congress on Science be held at Bormio (figure 14–19, 2026). The ICSS papers to be presented at al. 2010, Jones et al. for a paper.



11<sup>th</sup> International and Skiing (ICSS) will 1), Italy, on December has recently called for the Congress (Smith et 2020). This is a model

**METHODS:** A survey reviewers of papers for proceedings of scientific conferences. All reviewers had reviewed at least 10 conference papers exceeding 1000 words in length in the last two years. The items were:

was administered to 95

1. Problem identification: Have the authors clearly stated the purpose of the study?
2. Experimental design: Have the authors used a valid approach to the problem?
3. Analytical methods: Are the methods used valid, reliable and clearly described?

Figure 1. Bormio's.olympic slope

Reviewers involved in this study were permitted to list items not included in the above list. They were also given the opportunity to make comments. Frequencies of each response were determined by simple addition. Responses by each reviewer carried equal weighting.

Table 1. Frequency of Responses.

Item	Frequency
1. Problem identification	53
2. Experimental design	95
3. Analytical methods	65

**RESULTS:** Frequencies of each response are shown in Table 1. Separate the header of the table by a top and bottom line. Draw a solid line also on the bottom of last item in the list.

**DISCUSSION:** The high response rates for 'experimental design', 'analytical methods', and 'identification of problem' indicated that reviewers were concerned about the manner in which the studies were conducted. It is not possible to interpret specific reasons for these concerns due to the limitations of the survey instrument.

**CONCLUSION:** This study identified the most common causes of rejection of papers from conference proceedings. Although there were many reasons why papers were rejected, the most common were the use of unscientific methods or poor reporting of methods and a general lack of clarity. Another cause of rejection was failure to establish the relevance of the study. Some guidelines for improving the chances of acceptance were discussed.

## REFERENCES

Smith, J., Moore, A., Info, E. (2010). A survey of rejected conference papers. *Journal of Useful Information*, 50, 105-111.

Jones, T., Moore, A., Info, E. (2020). *New information for authors*. *Journal of Useful Information*, 23, 80-86.