

Introduction

Reviews of HIC2017 conference submissions are structured around the following areas:

- Relevance or significance of the topic/Originality
- Method/Research/Descriptive
- Presentation of information
- Discussion or interpretation
- Clarity of writing

What the reviewers may look for within each of these areas is outlined below.

Relevance or significance of the topic/Originality

‘The main reasons for accepting manuscripts are: their contribution and relevance to the field, excellence of writing, and quality of the study design’ (San Francisco Edit, 2016).

Does the paper:

- Relate clearly to the nominated theme area?
- Comply with editorial guidelines?
- Focus on a significant issue within this theme area? Significant issues are indicated in academic and professional discussion, policies and public debate. The ‘so what?’ question can be a good indication of the significance of the issue:
 - **The “So What” Question:**
 - What is the issue?
 - What are the specific questions surrounding the issue?
 - What is the context and background of the issue?
 - Why does the issue matter?
- Is the topic appropriate for this audience? Never assume readers have the level of knowledge that you do. They will not all be experts in your field. Use of technical jargon and technical detail sparingly.

Method/Research/Descriptive

- Does the literature review provide the context and rationale for the study?
- Is the literature review comprehensive while focussing only on relevant material?
 - Relevant does not necessarily mean recent. There’s nothing wrong with using older literature, particularly if it is foundational to the discipline. Current literature, particularly where trends, and/or statistical evidence is being considered, must also be included.

Presentation of information

Overall structure

- Are the title and abstract concise, relevant and informative?
- Does the paper **structure**
 - Introduce the main idea

- Provide the evidence used to prove the argument
- Outline the significance of the study?
- Are tables and graphs easy to read and clearly linked to the text?
- Is referencing comprehensive and does it conform to conference/journal guidelines?

Discussion or interpretation

- Is the study design, tools used, and procedures followed clearly explained? The method should be described in sufficient detail to enable the study to be repeated.
- Are limitations acknowledged?
- Conclusion: Does the conclusion move beyond a brief synopsis of the study to consider the relevance of the study and suggestions for further research?

Clarity of Writing

Really good papers are well thought out and carefully constructed. They bring out what's important, and that increases the interest and the impact of the paper (Gould, 2016).

The evidence suggests that a well written manuscript has a better chance of being accepted.

- Is the language clear, concise, and well-constructed?
- Is the paper written in active voice?
- Are redundancies avoided? These distract the reader from your main point and diffuse the impact of your message. Concise writing is much easier to understand. Examples of redundancies:
 - It is a fact that ...
 - It is rarely the case that ...
 - It was the cat that sat on the mat.
 - This is a subject that is very difficult.

References

Gould, J (2016), How to get published in high-impact journals: Big research and better writing', Nature Jobs Blog at <http://blogs.nature.com/naturejobs/2014/11/03/how-to-get-published-in-high-impact-journals-big-research-and-better-writing/> Accessed 30/11/2016

McKercher, B., Law, R. Weber, K., Song, H., Hsu, C., (2007), Why Referees Reject Manuscripts, Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Research, Vol. 31, No. 4, November 2007, 455-470

San Francisco Edit (2016), 'Eleven Reasons Why Manuscripts are Rejected' Online at <http://www.sfeddit.net/rejection.pdf> Accessed 30/11/2016

Patter Seven Reasons Why Journals Reject Papers, (2013) <https://patthomson.net/>

Prepared in consultation with the ACHI Scientific Conference Committee