



REVIEWERS GUIDELINES

REVIEWERS INSTRUCTIONS

Once the Conference Manager has assigned a paper to a Reviewer, a notification is automatically sent to the Reviewer via e-mail. The paper will be attached to the notification.

To complete your review:

1. Go to the EMAC Conference Website: <http://www.emac2012.org>

In the menu bar, go to 'E-Pass' or follow this link


<http://www.emac2012.org/r/e-pass>


2. You will be requested to login with your email and password.
If you cannot remember your password, follow the instructions to obtain a new one, and change it to something easy to remember.

You are on the reviewers' screen.

Here you will see the paper or list of papers that have been assigned to you for review.

You will see columns for:

- * Paper Title
- * Download Submission 
- * Track
- * Type of paper
- * Status
- * Review

3. You can download the PDF version of the submitted paper by clicking on the icon 
4. Once you have read the submission, you are kindly requested to fill in your review comments by clicking "**Start Review**" in the Review column.
You will then be in the Evaluation form.



REVIEWERS GUIDELINES

5. Evaluation Process

Please read carefully the evaluation process

EVALUATION PROCESS

There are three levels of evaluation.

- The first level evaluates the paper according to the criteria below on a scale of 1 to 5 (1 = Lowest and 5 = the highest)
- The second level is where you evaluate whether the paper should be accepted or rejected
- The third level is your qualitative feedback on the paper. Could you please give the author(s) **constructive qualitative feedback** as to the strengths and weaknesses of their paper in the comments box. If you identify strengths and weaknesses please endeavor to give specific reasons where and why the paper is strong, or weak avoiding unsupported critique or comment

Note to Reviewers of EMAC Conference papers

Please evaluate the research presented in the submitted document by answering the following questions.

The objective of a conference paper is to present interesting work that may not be completely polished for a Journal publication but that presents a potential for making an interesting contribution to Marketing.

Even though the basic demonstration of appropriate theory development applies to all papers, **work can be broadly classified in two categories that require somewhat different criteria of evaluation.** This is why **question 4** contains four items that are different depending on the type of paper submitted.

- Purely **conceptual papers whose contribution consists in synthesizing existing theories and/or proposing new explanations of a Marketing phenomenon without testing empirically these explanations** are evaluated on the conceptual clarity, the internal consistency, how well integrated the explanation is with existing and complementary theories and on the extent of the creativity of the new explanation. This applies to analytical papers which intend to provide insights into the understanding of a



REVIEWERS GUIDELINES

phenomenon.

- **Papers which provide not only a new explanation for a phenomenon but also perform an empirical test** are evaluated on the clarity of the conceptual development as well as on the operationalization of the variables, the appropriateness of the research design and of the data analysis.

For all the papers, the ability to identify clearly the research question, the contribution of the research and to report unambiguous results is vital. Therefore, while it may be difficult to summarize a full length paper into a document for submission to the Conference, it is essential to include all components of the research process that are indispensable to evaluate the appropriateness of the theoretical development or of the analysis.

The global recommendation to accept or to reject the paper for the conference should take into account the set of these criteria, including, at the margin, the ability of the presentation to stimulate debate among the audience and to give impetus for additional research in this area.

Please provide also qualitative feedback that explains the quantitative scores you used to evaluate the proposal on the scales.

Please fill in all the fields

6. **Save button:** allows you to save your evaluation and to return back to it (as many times as you wish) if you want to fine-tune or make modifications.
7. **SAVE & SUBMIT:** After having completed your review, please click **"Save & Submit"**.

You will receive a message "Thank you for your review. It has been successfully saved and submitted."



REVIEWERS GUIDELINES

- After having used the option 'Save & Submit', you **CANNOT** access the review any longer. This is your final review for the paper.
8. If you have any questions, please contact Cristina Setyar or one of the track chairs.
 9. The track chair/co-chair have access to your review. Based on all the reviews per paper, they shall make the final decision for each paper.