JURE 2023 – REVIEW GUIDELINES

Thank you for your kind willingness to act as a JURE 2023 reviewer!

The JURE 2023 review process will consist of one review round. Each submission will be reviewed by both a senior and junior researcher simultaneously. The combined review score will determine whether or not the submission can be accepted for presentation at JURE 2023.

As such, **all JURE 2023 submitters are required to sign up as a reviewe**r as well, which can be done easily upon completing your submission. Acting as a reviewer is mandatory to take part in the JURE 2023 submission process.

These guidelines are designed to help you prepare for your review task. Please read them carefully to ensure a fair and transparent review process for each submission.

Each proposal will be blind peer reviewed by two reviewers, one senior and one junior reviewer. Each reviewer is asked to score the quality of the proposal, indicating a score between 1 (very poor) and 10 (excellent) for a series of criteria, and to provide brief and constructive qualitative feedback in the appropriate text box. Scores and comments are sent to the submitter along with the final review outcome (accepted / rejected). As such, we ask our reviewers to be as constructive as possible, while also being considerate of the efforts invested in writing a proposal.

SINGLE PAPER

- ❑ The title is appropriate.
- ❑ The abstract is informative and gives an overview of the research developed (theoretical foundations, research aim, methodology, key results and conclusion).
- ❑ Theory I: Overview of the theoretical background is clearly presented.
- ❑ Theory II: Concepts are well defined and relevant.
- ❑ Theory III: The research question(s) and aim(s) is / are clearly communicated and testable. The question is logically derived from the theory described.
- ❑ Methods I: The sample is appropriate for testing the research question/hypothesis and well-described.
- ❑ Methods II: The design and research methods are clearly described, justified and well-chosen (e.g., no confounding variables).
- ❑ Methods III: The procedure is clearly explained.
- ❑ Methods IV: The methods of analysis are described and well-chosen.
- ❑ Results: The results are clearly communicated and presented so that the research question/hypothesis can be answered.
- ❑ Discussion I: Interpretations and conclusions derived are traceable.
- ❑ Discussion II: Results are discussed with respect to the research question/hypothesis and confrontation with other studies.
- ❑ Conclusion: Implications of the study for further research and/or practice are considered adequately.
- ❑ The research presented in the paper is of practical relevance.
- ❑ Overall impression of the paper.

POSTER PRESENTATION

- ❑ The title is appropriate.
- ❑ The abstract is informative and gives an overview of the research developed (theoretical foundations, research aim, methodology, key results and conclusion).
- ❑ The theoretical or conceptual framework is adequate.
- ❑ The research question/aim: the aim of the study (i.e. the primary research question or issue being addressed) is clear.
- ❑ The information about the study (sample, design, procedure, (in)dependent variables, and/or measures intended or already used) is informative and concise.
- ❑ Expected research findings and conclusions are traceable.
- ❑ Expected theoretical and/or practical implications of research are described.
- ❑ The research presented in the poster is of practical relevance.
- ❑ Overall impression of the poster.

ROUNDTABLE

- ❏ The title is appropriate.
- ❏ The abstract is informative and gives an overview of the research developed (theoretical foundations, research aim, methodology, key results and conclusion).
- ❏ Theoretical foundations: The theoretical information described is adequate to serve as a basis for a roundtable discussion.
- ❏ Aims/questions of the roundtable: The questions/issues that should be discussed in the roundtable are clearly communicated.
- ❏ The information on the different phases of the research is informative and concise.
- ❏ (Expected) results are discussed with respect to the research question/hypothesis.
- ❏ The research presented in the roundtable is of practical relevance.
- ❏ Overall impression of the roundtable.

ARISTOTLE UNIVERSITY OF THESSALONIKI

HELLENIC REPUBLIC UNIVERSITY OF MACEDONIA

REVIEW THRESHOLDS

The JURE International Organising Committee (IOC) has set the following thresholds for accepting a proposal at the JURE 2023 conference:

Score	Review Decision
Less than 30%	Automatic rejection for all contributions.
Over 70%	Automatic acceptance for all contributions.
Between 30 % - 70 %	Acceptance or rejection will be decided by the International Organising Committee. Please note that the International Organising Committee will not perform reviews but will make a decision based on, and respecting, the reviewers' suggestions and comments.

Please note that all scores refer to "combined review scores" (average of review scores).

Each submitter will receive the review outcome (accepted / rejection) along with access to their detailed review scores and feedback. In order to announce all results simultaneously, the review outcome will only be sent out after all review results have been collected. This means that submitters will be notified on or shortly after the **15th of February 2023**.