

## ASCE GUIDELINES FOR PEER REVIEWERS OF PROCEEDINGS PAPERS

Peer reviewers of proceedings papers may be drawn from the conference organizing committee, the technical program committee, or other technical committees. They may also be invited to serve by the proceedings editor(s). Peer reviewers for proceedings papers must be technically qualified in the subject area they are reviewing.

The responsibilities of a peer reviewer of proceedings papers include:

- A reviewer shall objectively judge the quality of an abstract or paper on its own merit and shall respect the intellectual independence of the author(s).
- Papers should be judged on the following qualities:
  - appropriateness for the conference theme or program;
  - originality of approach, concept, and/or application;
  - clarity and conciseness of expression, as well as correctness of English spelling and grammar; and
  - relevance to the civil engineering profession
- A peer reviewer should disqualify him/herself from reviewing a specific paper if:
  - The reviewer feels inadequately qualified;
  - The reviewer is unable to meet the deadline established by the proceedings editor; and
  - The reviewer has a conflict of interest or may appear to have one. Conflicts of interest may include interest in a competing product or service; a close personal relationship, such as parent/child, spouse, or sibling; or likelihood of gaining financially by publication of the paper.
- A peer reviewer will bring the following situations to the attention of the editor or technical committee:
  - The reviewer identifies substantial similarity between the abstract or paper under review and a paper that is already published or under consideration for publication.
  - The reviewer finds convincing evidence that a paper contains plagiarized material or falsified research data. In this case, ASCE staff should also be notified. (The reviewer should *not* contact the author directly.)
- A peer reviewer shall give unbiased consideration to all abstracts and papers offered for publication. The reviewer shall judge each on its merits without regard to any personal relationship or familiarity with the author(s), or to the race, gender, sexual orientation, religious belief, ethnic origin, citizenship, professional association, or political philosophy of the author(s).
- A peer reviewer shall treat all abstracts and papers as confidential documents and shall neither disclose nor discuss it with anyone outside the proceedings editor, the technical committee, and ASCE Publications staff.

If written evaluations are required by the proceedings editor, technical committee, or sponsoring Institute or Technical Group, the following best-practices should be observed:

- Reviewers shall explain and support their recommendations adequately so that the editor and authors may understand the basis of their comments.
- Any statement that an observation, derivation, or argument has been previously published should be accompanied by the relevant citation.
- Recommendations for revision should be specific and accompanied by a clear explanation of what work is required to address the recommendation.
- Reviewers shall refrain from personal criticism.