

Proceedings peer review policy

Peer review of papers published in the IOP Conference Series titles is undertaken through processes administered by the organizers and proceedings editors. The detailed procedures will vary from event to event according to the custom and practice of each community. Our publishing agreements require peer review to be undertaken in accordance with the principles outlined below.

In addition, all organizers/editors will be required to complete a form describing how the papers were peer reviewed. This information will be published as part of the proceedings.

All conferences are requested to adhere to the following minimum standards:

- Unbiased consideration is given to all papers offered for publication in the proceedings regardless of race, gender, religious belief, ethnic origin, citizenship or political philosophy of the authors.
- No terminology shall be used that, in the opinion of IOP Publishing, is offensive or might be perceived to be offensive to others.
- Authors and Editors agree to comply with our [ethical policy \(https://publishingsupport.iopscience.iop.org/ethical-policy-journals/\)](https://publishingsupport.iopscience.iop.org/ethical-policy-journals/), and understand that IOP Publishing has the right to investigate any suspicions and/or allegations of misconduct relating to published proceedings.
- Conference papers shall meet all the usual standards of quality for an IOP Publishing publication. However, referees shall take into account the conference nature of the papers and so consider background papers more favourably than would be normal for a regular paper. These allowances shall not go so far as to approve papers of low scientific standard or papers that have been published in written form elsewhere. Review papers are also welcomed and accepted.
- Reviewers shall give a clear statement of recommendation for each paper and supply comments to support their recommendation suitable for transmission to the author.
- Editors and Organisers shall only accept papers where there is clear support from the reviewers

Reviewers should consider the following key points related to scientific content, quality and presentation of the papers:

Technical Criteria

- Scientific merit: notably scientific rigour, accuracy and correctness.
- Clarity of expression; communication of ideas; readability and discussion of concepts.
- Sufficient discussion of the context of the work, and suitable referencing.

Quality Criteria

- Originality: Is the work relevant and novel?

- Motivation: Does the problem considered have a sound motivation? All papers should clearly demonstrate the scientific interest of the results.
- Repetition: Have significant parts of the manuscript already been published?
- Length: Is the content of the work of sufficient scientific interest to justify its length?

Presentation Criteria

- Title: Is it adequate and appropriate for the content of the paper?
- Abstract: Does it contain the essential information of the paper? Is it complete? Is it suitable for inclusion by itself in an abstracting service?
- Diagrams, figures, tables and captions: Are they essential and clear?
- Text and mathematics: Are they brief but still clear? If you recommend shortening, please suggest what should be omitted.
- Conclusion: Does the paper contain a carefully written conclusion, summarizing what has been learned and why it is interesting and useful?