

***HCI* Review Process**

The goal of the *HCI* review process is not only to judge which papers are good enough to publish, but more importantly, to help authors improve their initial submissions. The review process covers the time from initial submission to acceptance or rejection. After acceptance, papers enter the *HCI* Production Process.

The **Editor** oversees the review process. When an **Author** submits a paper, the **Editor** makes an initial assessment to see if it is appropriate for reviewing. If so, the Editor assigns it to a **Review Editor**, who is an Associate Editor on the Editorial Board. The Review Editor has the authority and responsibility to judge the paper, choose **Reviewers**, recommend revisions to the Author, and to decide on acceptance or rejection. The Review Editor consults with the Editor when needed. The Author deals directly with the Review Editor until a final decision has been made. The **Administrative Editor** coordinates the review process by keeping in contact with the Editor, Authors, and Review Editors.

The length of the review process depends on many variables. Reviewing is done on a voluntary basis and depends on the responsibility of all in the process. *HCI's* goal is to review initial submissions and respond to the Author within about four months. The process also depends on how much revision is required and how long the Author takes to do revisions. The typical review scenario below typically takes a year or more.

Typical Review Scenario

This typical scenario involves two rounds of revisions, the first for major revisions and the second for minor revisions, before acceptance. However, the paper could be rejected at any of the steps marked **(R)** below.

1. **Author:** Writes paper. Consults *HCI's* Information for Initial Submissions. Submits paper to Administrative Editor.
2. **Administrative Editor:** Logs paper with an *HCI* manuscript number and notifies Author.
3. **Editor:** Assesses paper for appropriateness for *HCI reviewing*, possibly by soliciting an assessment from an Associate Editor. **(R)**
4. **Editor:** Solicits a Review Editor.
5. **Administrative Editor:** Sends submission to Review Editor and notifies Author who the Review Editor is.
6. **Review Editor:** Solicits four Reviewers. Sends paper to Reviewers with a deadline.
7. **Reviewers:** Review paper (following *HCI's* Reviewer Instructions). Return reviews to Review Editor.

8. **Review Editor:** Integrates reviews and judges acceptability of paper. (R)
Formulates instructions for revising paper. Sends to Author.
9. **Administrative Editor:** Contacts Author to check on the progress of the revision.
10. **Author:** Revises paper. Submits revised paper to Review Editor.
11. **Review Editor:** Sends out revised paper to two selected Reviewers.
12. **Reviewers:** Re-review revised paper and send results to Review Editor.
13. **Review Editor:** Assesses reviews and judges acceptability of paper. (R)
Formulates instructions for revising paper. Sends to Author.
14. **Author:** Revises paper. Submits second revision to Review Editor.
15. **Review Editor:** Assesses revised paper and judges its acceptability. (R)
Accepts paper for publication. Notifies Author, Editor, and Administrative Editor.

(See the *HCI* Production Process for next steps.)

Special Issue Process

Special issues are organized on an ad hoc basis on a variety of topics. Sometimes the Editor solicits special issues, and sometime researchers approach the Editor with proposed topics. After negotiation, each special issue is assigned one or more **Special Issue Editors**, who solicit papers and manage the review process.

The review process for a special issue submission is same as for a regular paper, except that the Review Editor is one of the Special Issue Editors. Special Issues necessarily follow a strict schedule, which is set by the Editor and Special Issue Editors. The Call for Participation spells out the details of the topic and schedule.