

PAPER SELECTION PROCESS

I Paper Review Process

1) Overview

The same as the 4th Conference in Hanoi, the paper review for the 5th Conference consisted of two processes, the abstract review and full-paper review. As a result of the abstract review, papers were classified into three categories: A papers exposed to full-paper review to get involved in the Journal, B papers published in the Proceedings, and R papers to be rejected. Both abstracts and full papers were submitted through the web site, which was the first trial for an EASTS' conference. Abstracts were directly filled in the exclusive submission form and full papers were submitted as PDF files through the web site. Special caution was necessary for garbage characters which might exist in the abstract texts and PDF files.

2) Abstract Review

Abstracts were requested to be created within 500 words for the Fukuoka Conference. Submitted abstracts were organized by topic and reviewed by topic organizers. Referring to the three review criteria: novelty, reliability, and practicability, reviewers graded abstracts per criterion by five-point scale ranging excellent to very poor, and the final grade was determined by the total score. The core members of ISC, the Chairperson and two Vice Chairpersons finalized abstract review results examining them if there would not be deviations among topics or the reasons for rejection would be appropriate.

3) Full-paper review

Full-papers were reviewed by four reviewers including a topic organizer (ISC member) and three referees. The review criteria were: novelty, reliability, practicability, and writing skill. The papers were graded on basis of the criteria by five-point scale. The grading weight for each criterion was 40%, 30%, 20%, and 10%, respectively. Papers whose total grades were 3 or above were selected for the Journal and those under 3 were selected for the Proceedings. To conclude full-paper review, the core members of ISC further checked specially the validity of paper classification to the Proceedings in the full-paper review, and they also checked if there would not be deviations of paper review results among topics.

4) Revision of papers

Paper authors were requested to submit a paper revision report when they submitted the final full paper to report how they revised the paper following reviewers' comments and suggestions. If the ISC secretariat found revision of a paper was insufficient, the core members might consider rejection of the paper's involvement in the Journal or Proceedings.

II Paper Review Results

1) Paper review results for the Fukuoka Conference in comparison with the Hanoi Conference

	Fukuoka	Hanoi
(a) No. of abstracts	762	520
(b) No. of abstracts ranked A	525	317
(c) Percentage of abstracts ranked A [(a) / (b)]	68.9%	61.0%
(d) No. of A-rank full papers	386	244
(e) No. of B-rank full papers	84	81
(f) Total no. of the submitted full papers [(d) + (e)]	470	325
(g) Total no. of Journal papers	246	165
(h) Total no. of Proceedings papers	150	144
(i) Total no. of the papers [(g) + (h)]	396	309
(j) Percentage of Journal papers [(g) / (a)]	32.3%	31.7%

2) No. of papers by country

Country	Fukuoka	Hanoi
Japan*	93	80
Taiwan*	77	28
Korea*	51	55
Indonesia*	40	29
China*	30	18
Thailand*	28	17
Philippines*	20	21
Malaysia*	16	3
Australia*	7	13
Hong Kong*	7	7
Vietnam*	7	7
Singapore*	2	2
Lao*	0	2
New Zealand*	0	2
Others	18 (Nepal 1, Canada 1, U.S.A 7, UK 9)	11
(Total)	396	309

* EASTS member country

Tohru TAMURA, First Secretary, ISC, EASTS