

Rough Draft: Edited on August 2, 2018 (Ueno=Scarborough)

Guidelines for APMAA Conference Paper Review

This is the guidelines for APMAA conference organizers and paper reviewers.

An important mission of the APMAA, as an international academic association located in Asia, is to provide regional researchers an easy-to-access platform for communicating their research results with overseas colleagues. People who attend the conference, or who consult our conference proceedings, must be confident that the research results reported there are honest, accurate, and can be relied upon. Therefore, the APMAA review committee is expected to ensure the integrity and the reliability of the research literature in the proceedings.

In contrast to conferences such as the AAA, however, we also provide a strong developmental component to our review process. So, we are not just a filter, as in the case of the AAA, but rather, we are also developers.

As an honest reviewer of conference papers, you should do your best to read papers with care and sympathy. This is easy to do when the paper is good but is still desirable even when the paper is not. Many hours of work — in some cases, years of work — have gone into research and writing the paper you review.

Even if a paper is very bad, do your best to approach it with a generous spirit and provide authors constructive suggestions to improve their papers. It is important for all of us that we develop each other's competence in research.

This does not argue for lenience or laxity with regard to the scientific coherence of the paper. APMAA does not encourage defective research, but rather aims to help authors develop their work effectively.

Paper submissions to parallel sessions

Note that each author who registers for the conference is limited to two (2) full paper submissions for the parallel sessions. It is the responsibility of authors to ensure that submissions satisfy the formatting requirements below.

Formatting Requirements

All manuscripts should be in Times New Roman, font size 12, single-spaced with an **abstract of 200-300 words**. Include up to 5 keywords. An abstract should be on a separate page immediately preceding the text.

Manuscripts should be as concise as the subject and research method permit. The length of **text** should be **over 5,000 but not exceed 10,000 words**.

All papers will be double blind reviewed. To promote anonymous review, authors should not identify themselves directly or indirectly in their paper. **Single author should not use the editorial "we."** Referencing should follow the APA style (Refer to

<http://www.apastyle.org>).

The cover page should contain the title of the paper (all bold capitals), the author's name (first name, initial (s), and family name), title and affiliation, phone numbers, and email address.

Decisions on APMAA 2018 review results in the CMT system

Important Dates for Authors :

Full-paper Submission Deadline: July 10, 2018

Paper Acceptance Notification: by September 1, 2018

Conference Registration and Fee Payment Deadline: September 15, 2018

Proceedings Paper Submission Deadline: September 15, 2018

Some people request Deadline Extensions when the submission due date (June 10) is approaching. The conference organizer sometimes accepts an extension request by an individual. The extension period should be less than three weeks (July 28). Otherwise, the organizer may fall into trouble in developing the parallel session program in time. The program developing process includes a variety of time consuming tasks such as:

- reviewing papers,
- asking for revisions,
- re-submissions due-date and acceptance notifications.
- reviewing revised papers and
- notifying of “Accept” Decision (by September 1),
- requesting proceeding papers and registrations (before September 15),
- finishing the assignment of discussants and session chairs (by October 10),
- assigning presentation rooms,
- developing a final conference program and its printing, etc.

Note that assigning proper discussants and session chairs is a very complicated task in addition to being time-consuming. This process takes at least four months.

APMAA parallel sessions receive more than 100 paper submissions every year. Members of a review team engage in reviews on first-come first-served basis. The team chair notifies authors of review results soon after a review-completion. This allows authors enough time for polishing their papers. Authors, who received a “Conditionally Accepted” or “Awaiting Decision” notification, are requested to re-submit their revised paper before **August 25th** to get an “Accept” notification by

September 1. Papers that fail to satisfy minimum review standards are rejected.

Four Types of Decision Results: Accepted, Conditionally Accepted, Awaiting Decision, and Reject

Accepted (or Accept):

A paper that satisfies the review standards receives an “Accept” notification.

Conditionally Accepted (or Conditional Accept):

An author, who received a “Conditionally Accepted” notification, is required to polish the paper and resubmit a revised version by **August 25th** so that the organizer can finish the review and notifies you the “Accept” Decision by September 1. A paper is rejected if it fails to satisfy the minimum standards after the revision.

The following is sample test for the notification email:

Conditionally Accepted

The topic of the paper is interesting. However further editing is expected to become the final version. The conclusion section is very weak. The section should be re-written. Many grammatical mistakes in English are found. Editing by good native English speakers is expected.

Evaluation is postponed (Awaiting Decision)

Authors, who received an “**Evaluation is postponed (Awaiting Decision)**” notification, are requested to re-submit their revised paper before **August 25th** so that the organizer can finish its review and notify of an “Accept” Decision by September 1. Papers are rejected if they fail to satisfy minimum standards even after the revision.

The re-submission due date is **August 15** for the paper that receives its first review results before July 20 (This gives you more than a three-week period for revising.).

The following is example text from several notifications:

Evaluation is postponed (Awaiting Decision).

1. Your paper needs to be edited by native English speakers. Many sentences are difficult to understand.
2. Research questions should be clearly described in an early section. The conclusion section should discuss contributions of your study with respect to the research questions you set at the outset. The meaning of the sentence “The purpose of this study is to determine the development of financial technology companies towards Islamic banking financing and Islamic banking strategy.” in the abstract is not clear.

Please re-write and elaborate the abstract.

3. Readability should be improved throughout the paper. You must provide brief explanations to terminologies such as Types of contracts in the Table 1, UBS, UUS, UPRS in Table 2, etc. These words are new to most international readers.

Reject^(*):

APMAA does not make a “reject” decision at the first-time review, but rather we suggest improvements that will lead to an “accept” decision. If the re-submitted paper does not meet the minimum standards even after the revision, the paper is rejected.

^(*) APMAA must think about appropriate international representation in the list of presenters. Therefore APMAA does not apply the target standards across all applicants. We intentionally apply very **lenient standards** to some submissions, mostly from developing countries.

We believe this very lenient treatment provides an opportunity for them to develop the knowledge and skills to mature as scholars in the international sphere.

A case of very lenient review standards is applied (a double standard case)

Evaluation is postponed (Awaiting Decision).

Conditionally Accepted

Add the “references” section. The topic of the paper is interesting. However this paper needs to be re-edited and elaborated. The overall clarity and English of the paper are much improved **by using professional editing services.**

Important information to annual conference organizers

APMAA, as an international academic association founded in Asia, has a special mission to provide regional researchers an easy-to-access platform **for communicating their research results with overseas colleagues.** Presentations at an international conference are important to early-career scholars. **The historic strengths of the APMAA annual conference have been the multinational range of authors contributing to the conference.** Conference organizers must think about appropriate international representation in the list of presenters.

The APMAA headquarters has paid careful attention to the balance of quality and volume of the conference papers. We request that conference organizers inform the headquarters of names of candidates for a “Reject” Decision and get approval before sending a “Reject” notification to any author.

From: s-ueno [mailto:s-ueno@dab.hi-ho.ne.jp]

Sent: Tuesday, July 24, 2018 6:12 AM

Subject: RE: Would you please add your ideas? FW: Guidelines for conference paper reviewers

Thank you very much for the feedback to the draft of guidelines. I edited it because we need to reduce confusions in a review process. The guideline is in my mind since the 2013 Nagoya conference when all paper reviews were conducted by a few members (mostly by Prof. Scarbrough, Prof. Omar, and Ueno).

The expected role to submission paper reviewers is a gatekeeper, i.e., to find papers that are inappropriate to the APMAA conference in quality (we focus mainly on paper formats) and provide helpful suggestions to the authors so that they can improve it and re-submit. I have already sent rough drafts of the Reviewers Guidelines to Professor Elgammal, Mohammed (m.elgammal@qu.edu.qa) and asking him to develop their version. Currently most papers from a few countries fail to satisfy our regular (even lenient) review standards. The research environment of failed authors is not good. Some of them have no access or very limited access to English journals. Authors rely mainly on web-sites materials and local literature.

Considering the above, I am thinking of an adoption of a lenient treatment to some certain submissions. I know that it is not an easy matter to position their papers and presentations properly in the conference schedule because of the broad gap in quality of papers (in fact, some of first submission papers do not include references, introduction and/or conclusions sections). APMAA, as a local academic association, must take care of them. I remind China before 2000s. Today, the quality of papers produced by leading universities in China is world class.

Guidelines for conference paper reviewers

Excerpt from

https://www.icahdq.org/members/group_content_view.asp?group=186109&id=633473

When you review full papers and/or extended abstract, please make sure these meet the **requirements stated in the call for papers** also indicated below.

1. **Full length completed research papers** (5,000–10,000 words excluding references and tables). Submitted papers must NOT have been previously presented, scheduled for presentation, published, accepted for publication, and if under review, must NOT appear in print before the conference.
2. **Requirements stated in the call for papers**

All manuscripts should be in Times New Roman, font size 12, single –spaced with **an abstract of 200-300 words**. Include up to 5 keywords. An abstract should be on a separate page immediately preceding the text.

Manuscripts should be as concise as the subject and research method permit. **The length of text should be over 5,000 but not exceed 10,000 words.**

All papers will be double blind reviewed. To promote anonymous review, authors should not identify themselves directly or indirectly in their paper. Single authors should not use the editorial “we.” Referencing should follow the **APA style (Refer to <http://www.apastyle.org>)**.

The cover page should contain the title of the paper (all bold capitals), the author’s name (first name, initial (s), and family name), title and affiliation, phone numbers, and email address.

3. **Extended abstracts** (2,500-3,500 words) with a full paper submitted at least 6 weeks prior to the conference in May. Extended abstracts are intended for work in progress, offering the opportunity to present on-going research that has not yet reached completion at the time of the submission deadline. Extended abstracts should present in a concise way the purpose of the paper, main theoretical framework/ assumptions and if applicable research methods and preliminary and/or expected results. Extended abstracts should clearly STATE THE CONTRIBUTION of the paper.

Criteria for evaluation

Excerpt from

https://www.icahdq.org/members/group_content_view.asp?group=186109&id=633473

1. Originality of ideas/approach and level of innovativeness

When evaluating this criterion, please consider the following questions to make an assessment:

- Are the ideas advanced in the paper/extended abstract actually new?
- If conceptual, does the paper/extended abstract expand our understanding of a new domain?
- Does the paper/extended abstract introduce new constructs or concepts that broaden our ideological understanding?

2. Quality of **theoretical** argument

Does the paper/extended abstract address a **theoretical or empirical** problem? When evaluating this criterion, please consider the following questions to make an assessment:

- Does the paper/extended abstract present a clear, precise and complete review of relevant literature?
- Does the theoretical argument engage the conceptual/ empirical investigation appropriately?
- Does the paper/extended abstract involve the relevant literature?

3. Quality of empirical or conceptual design

If the paper/extended abstract is **EMPIRICAL**, please consider the following questions:

- Are the methods used to collect and analyze data appropriate to the research questions asked?
- Are the data collection and analysis methods clearly explained and without major flaws?

If the paper/extended abstract is **CONCEPTUAL**, please consider the following questions:

- Do(es) the author(s) provide a clear argument for why it is important to discuss, define, and/or question specific concepts, models, and/or ideas?
- FOR EXTENDED ABSTRACTS: Does the extended abstract present clearly the main propositions and/or hypotheses that will be discussed and unfold in the full paper?

4. Quality of development and support for the propositions/hypotheses

If the paper/extended abstract is EMPIRICAL, please consider the following questions:

- Does the paper establish a clear link between theory and evidence? If the submission is an extended abstract, does it clear state what link can be expected between theory and evidence once the empirical data are collected?
- ONLY FOR FULL PAPERS: Does the author conclude beyond what the data support?

If the paper/extended abstract is CONCEPTUAL, please consider the following questions:

- Does the paper develop adequate and innovative propositions to clarify, define, and question core concepts in a field and/or to develop a new theory or perspective?
- FOR EXTENDED ABSTRACTS: does the extended abstract clarify how the author(s) intend(s) to develop and support the propositions and hypotheses in the full paper?

5. Presentation: Coherence and clarity of structure and thought

When evaluating this criterion, please consider the following questions to make an assessment:

- Are relevant terms and concepts explained?
- Does the paper/extended abstract have a clear line of argument?
- Does the paper/extended abstract use an accessible and comprehensible language?

6. Contribution to theory building

When evaluating this criterion, please consider the following questions to make an assessment:

- Does the paper/extended abstract discuss possible implications for new theory?

Does the paper/extended abstract clearly spell out its own original theory contribution?