IEEE Pervasive Computing
Best Practices for Managing Submissions for the AEIC

Associated Editors-in-Chief (AEIC) manage the peer review process for “queue submissions”, i.e., those received outside the scope of a special issue. The role of the AEIC is similar to the role of a program co-chair for a conference in that they are assigning reviewers and making a recommendation based on the input of those reviewers.

Recruiting Reviewers: AEICs are expected to identify strong, qualified reviewers for the papers they are assigned. Pervasive Computing expects three reviewers per paper, two of which must come from non-EB members.

A good best practice in recruiting reviewers is to line them up via personal interaction or via email rather than to rely on the Manuscript Central system. Emails from Manuscript Central are easy to ignore or even drop directly into the spam folder. Let your reviewers know to expect the invitation from Manuscript Central. We have prepared a “reviewer handout” that lets reviewers know what we expect from them. You can download a copy from here:
http://www.computer.org/web/computingnow/pervasivecomputing/reviewer_guidance.pdf

Keep in mind that we have also identified a review panel of researchers who have agreed to provide about 4 reviews per year. We keep track of the review load informally in a google document (https://goo.gl/f8bXFP). Please be sure to keep that information updated as you request reviews from them. If you have any suggestions for additional review board members, please let the EIC know.

Also, it is good to remind your reviewers to pay particular attention to the “Private” vs. “Public” comments. The private comments are visible only to the AEIC and the editor-in-chief. The public comments go to the authors. It is a hassle to have to rescind the recommendation from the AEIC (i.e., you) and then have you rescind the review and then have the reviewer swap the comments and then have you make a new recommendation. It can add a lengthy delay to the process. If you notice a reviewer has made this (unfortunately, common) mistake, please rescind it ASAP and ask them to fix it. Please be sure to check before you submit your recommendation!

Also, please set high expectations for the magazine content. Traditionally, IEEE Pervasive Computing has had about a 15% acceptance rate and an h-index around 35.
We’re looking for high quality, accessible content appropriate to a broad audience – not just highly specialized experts in the field.

Submissions: The submission guidelines for authors are available at [http://www.computer.org/web/peer-review/magazines](http://www.computer.org/web/peer-review/magazines) The big ones that authors forget are the word limits (with figures counting as 250 words) and the citation limits (regular paper is up to 15 citations; survey paper is up to 30). These limits should have been checked by IEEE staff before the paper got to you. If you suspect that a submission is outside these limits, you can view the word and figure count for a submission in the “Custom Questions” section – just click on “Show.” (You find the “Custom Questions” section under the “Take Action” checkmark - “Manuscript Information” tab - scroll down to the end of the “Author-Supplied Data” section, right before the “Plagiarism Check” section):

Note that plagiarism cases are on the rise. If you see a RED dot next to a submission, this means that IEEE staff has flagged this as a potential plagiarism case, so don’t work on this (you will get notified if this gets resolved). If there is a PURPLE dot next to a submission, this means that the Editor-in-Chief has flagged this as a potential plagiarism case - again: don’t work on this until it gets resolved (and you get notified). You can see the “plagiarism score” that the system has computed for a particular submission under “Take Action” checkmark - “Manuscript Information” tab - (scroll down) “Plagiarism Check” (see screenshot above).

Recommendations: Once the reviews come back, the AEIC (i.e., you) makes a recommendation as to whether to accept the submission, accept the submission with MINOR revisions, accept the submission with MAJOR revisions, or reject the paper.
Once you have read through the comments from reviewers, the AEIC should write a short meta-review explaining your recommendation, particularly when the reviews were conflicting. (You can also ask for an extra review in this event.) The big differences between a MINOR and a MAJOR revision are (a) the amount of time permitted and (b) how the revised submission is handled. Authors receiving a MINOR revision are given 3 weeks to resubmit their manuscript whereas authors receiving a MAJOR revision are given 8 weeks. Further, a MINOR revision will be returned directly to you (i.e., the AEIC) for a new recommendation, with no further review required. You are expected to check that the reviewers’ comments were addressed, much like a paper shepherd for a conference. Of course, you can still send the revised paper out for another round of reviews, or even ask for just a single re-review from one particular reviewer. A MAJOR revision, on the other hand, will automatically be sent back out to the exact same reviewers that reviewed the original submission. When the reviews come back, you again must review them, write a short meta-review, and then make a new recommendation. Note that a paper that went through a MAJOR revision should usually not be asked for another MAJOR revision. If the second round of reviews asks for another MAJOR revision, you should consider asking the authors to re-submit a new version (i.e., REJECT with encouragement to resubmit). If you have questions, consult with your EIC.

Accepted Submissions: At this point in time, accepted articles are given a round of light copyediting. Please contact the EIC should an article that you want to accept need heavy amounts of copyediting or make note of it in your meta-review.

Rejected Submissions: For rejected papers, consider whether the paper has strong potential, but just needs massive changes. When that is the case, please encourage the authors to take the reviewers’ comments and resubmit.