

Rethinking transport

27–30 April 2020



1. Instructions for conference paper review process

Reviewers will access a standardized online review rubric, to ensure consistency of grading. In order to have an overview of all the papers assigned to one reviewer and to make a balanced evaluation, reviewers must read thoroughly through the assigned papers before they start the evaluation process. Reviewers may make as many editorial or other comments as necessary to help authors improving the final papers. The comments should remain concise, impersonal, free of any bias and clearly indicate the required revisions or actions needed.

Table 1: Review rubric structure as seen by reviewer

Questions	1	2	3	4	5	Weight (0-2)
Title and abstract clearly communicates scope and outcome (Category 1)						0.1
Crucial previous work described and referenced, with clear research scope and objective (Category 2)						0.2
Methodology and data are appropriate for research scope and related to findings (Category 3)						0.3
Results are properly described, visualized, and discussed (Category 4)						0.3
Easiness of reading, including language, with sufficient length for the topic studied (Category 5)						0.1
<i>Overall score</i>						
Self-evaluation of the reviewer's competence for this topic						N/A
Is this paper relevant for the TRA2020 theme "Rethinking Transport"?	Yes	Somewhat		No		N/A
Is this paper free of sensitive statements, special interests or advertising?	Yes	Somewhat		No		N/A
Is the paper following the TRA2020 template instructions?	Yes	Somewhat		No		N/A
A. Comments to the author <i>What are strengths and weaknesses of this paper?</i> <i>Highlight major contributions, and any issues that should be addressed.</i>						
B. Comments to the editor <i>Why should this paper be accepted or rejected, including but not limited to scientific soundness, novelty, quality, importance, and suitability for the conference?</i> <i>If manuscript is to be rejected as is, clearly state and justify that in the comments.</i>						



Table 2: Description of review criteria

Category	1 – Unacceptable	2 – Poor	3 - Average	4 – Good	5 – Excellent
1: Title and abstract	Very unclear title and abstract, AND without clearly explained scope and outcomes, OR significant discrepancy between main text and abstract information	Title and abstract somewhat clear to limited expert audience, AND some aspects missing, e.g., (scope, methods, outcomes),	Title and abstract mostly clear to expert audience, AND some aspects missing, e.g., (scope, methods, outcomes),	Somewhat descriptive title and abstract, AND clarity in only some aspects, e.g., (scope, methods, outcomes), even to general TRA audience	Very descriptive title and abstract, AND great clarity in all the aspects, e.g., (scope, methods, outcomes), even to general TRA audience
2: Research scope	Missing and unclear explained scope description, OR fundamental misunderstanding of problem studied OR lacking any references needed to position with respect to previous work	Somewhat clearly explained scope, AND missing relevant ad recent references, OR added too many unnecessary and irrelevant citations	Clearly explained scope description with minimum amount of relevant references OR Enough of relevant and recent references across time	Clearly explained scope description, AND minimum amount of relevant references, including some key references from different research sources and contradicting views	Accurate description of reasons for research, AND clearly outlined the boundary of research aims, AND substantive referencing across time, with recent references, citation of contradicting references providing balanced view of previously published work
3: Methodology and data	Very old and insufficient for defined research aims and scope, OR limited repeatability of methodology, AND missing statistical soundness preventing sound conclusions, missing replication, confounding, poor sampling, lack of randomization,	Missing description of key components of data collection process, OR missing account of ethical considerations	Appropriate and somewhat described data and methods used for research aim and scope, OR provided references to relevant state-of-the-art research methods and data	Included description of key components of data collection process and implemented methodology, AND ensuring basic data validity testing available	New methodology, addressing the challenges of previous methodologies, AND extremely appropriate for defined research aims and scope, OR full repeatability with sufficient knowledge, clear ethical considerations, sources of bias accounted in analysis



4: Results and discussion	Lacking deep analysis and interpretation of results, AND contains unnecessary information, OR incorrect visual representations, AND too many instances of not shown results	Lacking deep analysis and interpretation of results, OR contains unnecessary information, OR incorrect visual representations, OR too many instances of not shown results	Basic analysis presented OR Interpretation of results sufficient, AND sufficient level of correct visual representations in form of tables or figures, in addition to written text	Basic analysis presented AND Interpretation of results sufficient, AND sufficient level of correct visual representations in form of tables or figures, in addition to written text	Thorough analysis and interpretation of results, OR novel visualization methods for results, AND alternative interpretations of results discussed, AND discussion of limitations and future research included
5: Easiness of reading	Missing, misplaced or un-descriptive tables and figure titles, AND poor English language preventing full comprehension, AND poor sectioning of the paper structure	Missing, misplaced or un-descriptive tables and figure titles, AND poor sectioning of the paper structure OR poor English language preventing full comprehension	Somewhat descriptive table and figure titles, AND appropriate sectioning and sub sectioning of paper structure enabling somewhat easy comprehension OR sufficient English language argumentation	Somewhat descriptive table and figure titles, AND very good English language argumentation, AND very good sectioning and sub sectioning of paper structure enabling easy comprehension	Very descriptive table and figure titles, AND excellent English language argumentation, AND excellent sectioning and sub sectioning of paper structure enabling easy comprehension

Categories for review have different relative weight, ranging on the absolute scale from 0.1 to 1.0, in increments of 0.1 points, as presented in the following table.

Table 3: Review category weight

Category number	Category name	Category weight
1	Title and abstract	0.1
2	Research scope	0.2
3	Methodology and data	0.3
4	Results and discussion	0.3
5	Easiness of reading	0.1

