

Symposium Paper Review

Paper Number _____

Reviewer Number _____

Paper Title _____

Please rate this paper (circle a number for each item). Criteria adapted from the AOM OB Division.

- | | | | | | | | |
|--|----------------|------------------|------------|------------|---|---|-----|
| 1. To what extent were the goals/purpose of this paper clearly specified? | Not At All | Somewhat | Completely | | | | |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 2. To what extent were ideas and material organized in a logical and meaningful way? | Not At All | Somewhat | Completely | | | | |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 3. To what extent is a discussion of prior work (background, theory etc.) provided? | Not Applicable | Not At All | Somewhat | Completely | | | |
| | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 7 |
| 4. To what extent did you gain new insights from reading the paper? | Not At All | Somewhat | Greatly | | | | |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 5. To what extent did the paper make a significant contribution to the literature/Symposium? | Not At All | Somewhat | Greatly | | | | |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 6. If this is an empirical paper, to what extent were the research methods and analytical techniques valid and appropriate to the research question? | Not Empirical | Not At All | Somewhat | Completely | | | |
| | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 7 |
| 7. If this is an empirical paper, to what extent were the findings adequately and accurately described? | Not Empirical | Not At All | Somewhat | Completely | | | |
| | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 7 |
| 8. To what extent is the Discussion (and/or Conclusion—final) section well written? | Not At All | Somewhat | Completely | | | | |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 9. To what extent does this paper stimulate thought or debate? | Not At All | Somewhat | Greatly | | | | |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 10. To what extent do you think that others would be interested in hearing this paper presented? | No | Maybe | Definitely | | | | |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 11. Should this paper be accepted for the Symposium program? | No | If There Is Room | Definitely | | | | |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

Comments: Please provide the authors with at least a half page of constructive comments on the back of this form using a positive, professional tone. Since our Symposium is largely developmental, you should include both strengths and weaknesses as well as specific ideas on how weaknesses might be addressed. While it is certainly acceptable to reject a paper for problems that cannot be fixed or which contain serious design and analysis flaws, high-quality reviewers do not reject papers without comment or without providing advice on the paper's limitations so that authors may benefit by making improvements in their future writing and research efforts.