

# CCFS2017 Guidelines for Reviewer



Date: 06<sup>th</sup> & 07<sup>th</sup> October, 2017  
Venue: GTU Chandkheda Campus, Ahmedabad.

Gujarat  
Technological  
University 

International Conference on  
**Enhancing Economic Productivity and Competitiveness**  
through Financial and Monetary Reforms

CCFS2017

Conference by Centre for Financial Services

To bring transparency and improve quality of conference proceedings/book a sound policy or guidelines are required. With this objective, these guidelines have been adopted for CCFS2017.

## 1. First Phase:

The Reviewer will evaluate papers submitted for the conference based on below criteria. The First Phase of the Review will only focus on the quality of the paper. The marks are segregated on below mentioned criteria. The marks will be given by reviewer during blind review process. The total of all the criteria will be 75.

Sr No	Particular	Marks
1	<b>Objectives and Methodology</b>	15
2	<b>Literature Review and Research Gap</b>	15
3	<b>Analysis Part</b>	25
4	<b>Finding and its relationship with Objectives</b>	10
5	<b>Drafting, Flow of Information and Paper writing skills</b>	10
	<b>Total</b>	75

**Note:** In case of Conceptual paper or Case Study, above points need to be evaluated with practical approach by reviewer. For Example, a conceptual paper may not have much analysis of data, but in this situation reviewer must focus on arguments by which new concept is derived or presented. Similarly a case study may not have much literature review, but in this type of papers reviewer will have to give weightage to the method by which the problem is identified or stated. In such types of situations, reviewer will have to evaluate in such a way that it should not create injustice to authors submitting conceptual paper or case study.

## 2. Second Phase:

After completion of first phase, second level reviewer will rate the paper for its relevancy with the main theme of the conference. As the quality of research is already assessed in first phase, the second phase will focus only on relevancy. Higher relevancy will have more chance of publication and similarly low relevancy will have lower chance of publication.

### 2.1 Trimming based on Relevancy:

In the second phase reviewer will rate the papers on the below scale

- Low relevancy
- Medium relevancy
- High relevancy

The relevancy test will consider marks with below mentioned weightage

Sr No	Level of Relevancy	Weightage to be count
1	High relevancy	1/1 or 100% of marks given by reviewer
2	Medium relevancy	2/3 or 66.67% of marks given by reviewer
3	Low relevancy	1/3 or 33.33% of marks given by reviewer

Example:

Marks of Papers out of 75	Level of Relevancy	Weightage to be given to marks	Marks to be taken in calculation	Marks wise Position
66	Low	1/3	22	3
75	Medium	2/3	50	2
55	High	1	55	1
45	Low	1/3	15	4

This will improve the quality of the proceedings as well as it will decide the priority for publication of the research work. Higher the marks and relevancy, better the scope for publication. The readers will have good impression in the mind based on the papers which have higher relevancy in the beginning of the book.

In above example, case 2 has 75 marks and case 3 has 55. Though the paper of case 2 is good as per the parameters defined above in first phase, but has less relevancy compared to case 3. When a reader opens a book, he would like to see topics more closely related with the title of the book.

## 2.2 Eliminating Plagiarised Work:

Plagiarised work should be limited for every paper. Papers/articles with higher plagiarism ratio should be punished by reducing the score of the paper. The score of the research paper can be reduced to or should be calculated according to the ratio of actual/genuine work of the researcher.

**For example,**

A paper has secured 50 Marks after the relevancy check of 2<sup>nd</sup> phase. But it has 20% Plagiarism ratio.

Here, actual/genuine work of the researcher is 80%. So his final score will be  $50 \times 80\% = 40$  Marks.

Conference convener or review committee or any competent authority can decide the maximum plagiarism ratio to be allowed. After following above methodology, Good papers will automatically get filtered and will find place according to their score in the book.

University may Publish around 40% of the total papers registered. However, this ratio is liable to change depending on the decision of the University and shall be final.

## 3. Presentation Evaluation Guidelines:

General practice during the conference is to evaluate presentations and based on presentation's marks the organizers declare "Best Paper" awards and prizes. This system evaluates presentation and gives award. Which means if a person has good presentation skills, he/she may get best paper prize even if his/her paper is not of excellent quality compared to a person who do not have good presentation skills but has done really a good research.

Sometimes it is also seen that, organizers declares prizes according to theme. If there is only one presenter in the theme, then he/she will get best paper prize without any close competition. This indicates that organizers have given more focus on the area of research rather than quality of the research.

Above are probable circumstance which may arise. So to avoid such circumstances these guidelines are adopted and implemented.

- a. The prizes will be awarded based on both the marks i.e. **Marks after relevancy scale application and marks of presentation**. The total marks of the presentation will be 25 as segregated below.

Presentation Skills	15 Marks
Content Covered	10 Marks
<b>Total</b>	<b>25 Marks</b>

- b. If more than one person has evaluated presentation then the average of all the evaluator will be counted.
- c. The marks of the presentation will be calculated in the ratio of marks obtain in the first and second phase. For clarification please see below example.

A paper has secured 60 marks out of 75 marks in first phase. The paper is highly relevant to the theme of the conference. So 100% marks will be counted which will be 60. The paper has got 20% plagiarism ratio. Considering genuine work, the final score will be

$$60 \times 80\% = 48 \text{ marks.}$$

So out of total 75 marks, the score of the paper is 48, which is 64%.

The score of presentation is 20 marks.

But it will be consider only 64% of 20 marks i.e. 12.8000 .(Here the logic is that, for presentation also the researcher should be given credit for the work which is genuine.

$$\text{Final marks for the award} = 48 + 12.8000 = \mathbf{60.8000}$$

- d. The marks should be consider up to four decimals in deciding the ranks for the prize winners. If the marks are equal up to four decimals, then the prize will be awarded jointly to the papers.
- e. The prizes will be awarded only to the papers which are published.

### Explanatory Note:

By following above method, the prizes will be awarded to the papers which are published and has higher relevancy with the main theme having minimum plagiarism ratio.

Particular	Reference	A	B	C	D	E	F
Score out of 75 Marks	a	60	60	60	60	60	60
Relevancy		High	Medium	Low	High	Medium	Low
Relevancy Weightage	b	100%	66.67%	33.33%	100%	66.67%	33.33%
<b>Score after relevancy check</b>	<b>c = a*b</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>40.002</b>	<b>19.998</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>40.002</b>	<b>19.998</b>
Plagiarism	d	20%	10%	5%	50%	10%	5%
Ration of Genuine work (100-plagarism)	e =100-d	80%	90%	95%	50%	90%	95%
<b>Final score after plagiarism check</b>	<b>f = e*c</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>36.0018</b>	<b>18.9981</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>36.0018</b>	<b>18.9981</b>
% of marks secured out of 75	$g = \frac{(100*48)}{75}$	64.00%	48.00%	25.33%	40.00%	48.00%	25.33%
Presentation marks (out of 25)	h	20	21	22	23	21	15
<b>Final marks of presentation</b>	<b>i = h * g</b>	<b>12.8000</b>	<b>10.0805</b>	<b>5.5728</b>	<b>9.2000</b>	<b>10.0805</b>	<b>3.7996</b>
<b>Final Score for Award</b>	<b>j = f + i</b>	<b>60.8000</b>	<b>46.0823</b>	<b>24.5709</b>	<b>39.2000</b>	<b>46.0823</b>	<b>22.7977</b>
Final Rank		1	2	5	4	2	6

As second rank is shared by two papers, hence no 3<sup>rd</sup> position is given.

---0---