

### **Changes to paper selection procedure**

Present paper selection procedures are given as Annex 1. Possibly as a result of the conference attracting higher-quality papers, the system is beginning to show strain.

1. The biggest problems of any double-blind selection/shortlisting procedure are that it is difficult to group the papers yielded by the double-blind system into coherent sessions and to ensure that the Chairs/Discussants are fully conversant with the topics covered.
2. It is impossible to maintain the announced schedule when paper reviewers decline to review papers at the last minute.
3. It is therefore proposed that
  - a. All abstracts be subject to review by four members of the Board so that in the event one person declines we still have enough reviews to ensure fair assessment.
  - b. All papers continue to be subject to review by the designated Chair and Discussant but they must review all papers sent to them unless they identify a conflict or inability to review within two days of receipt of papers. If such a difficulty is reported to the Administrative Partner within two days of receipt of paper, alternative arrangements will be made, that may include asking the declining Board member to switch to a different session or review a paper from a different session.

## Annex 1: Present paper selection procedures

- 1.0 Getting selected to present a paper at CPRsouth is valuable in several senses: it is the result of a rigorous competitive process; it provides useful feedback that can help the researcher develop him/herself; it comes with significant financial assistance to participate. Therefore, CPRsouth makes best efforts to ensure that the selection process is fair and that no one has undue advantages.
- 2.0 The first screen is double-blind. Abstracts received by the closing date are sent to three judges (members of the CPRsouth Board + other senior scholars attending CPRsouth) after removing identifying information. The administrative partner, LIRNE*asia*, makes best efforts to ensure that abstracts from a person directly connected to a judge do not get assigned to such a judge (e.g., a LIRNE*asia* researcher's abstracts are not given to Rohan Samarajiva). In the rare case that we miss such a conflict and a judge notices the conflict, the abstract is returned without a score and alternative arrangements are made. The scores given by the judges are averaged to arrive at the shortlist.
- 3.0 The shortlisted abstracts are grouped into sessions by the administrative partner who also assigns senior scholars as Chair and Discussant based on their expertise and wishes. Best efforts are made to avoid conflicts in this non-blinded review phase, i.e., Samarajiva does not normally serve as Chair/Discussant in sessions with a LIRNE*asia* researchers. In the event such a conflict arises, especially because of adjustments made because of cancellations, an external judge will be substituted for assessing the affected paper.
- 4.0 The scores given by the second-round judges (the Chair and Discussant of the session) on a common template are averaged to select the three or fewer papers that will be funded per session. Judges are encouraged to give feedback to all papers, and in particular to the selected papers, if necessary on multiple drafts, so that their quality can be improved prior to the conference.
- 5.0 The top paper in each session is then shortlisted (total of seven) for the best-paper competition. The judges for this competition are appointed by the Board and do not participate in the selection process that leads up to the shortlisting. They read the papers and policy briefs and listen to the presentations. Here, too precautions are taken to avoid conflict of interest. The selection of the winner is based on the scores given by the judges and also the evaluations by the audience.
- 6.0 The above procedures for selecting papers have been followed in all CPRsouth conferences except the first, where not all papers came through competition. The best-paper competition which started in CPRsouth3 in Beijing has followed the procedures set out under 5.0 throughout.

