



Québec City, Canada

IMPC 2016

XXVIII International Mineral Processing Congress
September 11–15, Québec City Convention Center

GUIDELINE SERIES

FOR TRACK / SYMPOSIUM ORGANIZERS OF THE TECHNICAL PROGRAM

SCOPE

A series of guidelines and platform instructions have been developed to assist members during their term. The guidelines and platform instructions have been grouped by the three core tasks: 1. Call for Abstracts, **2. Paper Review Process**, 3. Program Building. All guidelines and platform instructions are distributed by email as well as posted on the **Organizer Tools webpage**: <http://www.impc2016.org/en/IMPC/2016/Technical-Program/Organizer-Tools.aspx>.

Guidelines were developed for:

- 1a. Guidelines for Reviewing/Approving Abstracts**
- 2a. Guidelines for Reviewing Papers (detailed below)**
- 3a. Guidelines for Building the Program**
- 3d. Guidelines for Onsite Protocol.**

RELATED TASKS

2a. Guidelines for Reviewing Papers

Your activities will increase as the deadline to submit papers approaches. Papers often arrive within the online platform just before the deadline. Some papers will arrive after the deadline. The symposium organizer has the right to accept late submissions, but within limits.

During the week before the deadline for paper submissions, you will need a few hours at a computer with a high-speed link to access the online platform. After the deadline it is recommended that you visit the online platform often to access your papers and assign reviewers as needed.

The abstract review / approval process begins January 1 through March 15. Authors are asked to submit the final version of their papers by March 15.

Deadline for Track / Symposium Organizers to complete the review process is April 1.

ONLINE PLATFORM INSTRUCTIONS

ONLINE PLATFORM INSTRUCTIONS have been developed as a companion to this series of guidelines. Online Platform Instructions for **Track / Symposium Leaders** include / demonstrate **How to Navigate the Online System when Assigning Reviewers** (visual aids incorporated).

Reviewers have separate instructions; [please take a moment to read over the reviewers documents listed below](#).

- 1. Platform Instructions for Reviewers: “How to Navigate and Review Papers”** (visual aids incorporated).
- 2. Referee Sheet** (criteria) which is used as a guide for final judgement.

All Instructions and documentation needed for the paper review process are available online on

the Organizer Tools page at:

<http://www.impc2016.org/en/IMPC/2016/Technical-Program/Organizer-Tools.aspx>

EVALUATING PAPERS / CRITERIA

Papers are to be entered directly within the online platform
<https://security.gibsongroup.ca/impc/abstract-submission.php>.

Below is a list that can be used as guidance when making your review comments.

CRITERIA

- Is the paper of interest to those involved in the mineral processing industry?
- Does the manuscript require editing/rewriting? If so, which sections?
- Is the material clearly presented?
- Should figures, tables, or text be deleted, modified, or condensed? (Please be specific)
- Are there any inaccuracies of statements, equations, figures, or conclusions?
- Does the paper completely address the stated objectives?
- Are the conclusions logically based on the text?
- Have any pertinent references been omitted?
- Is the paper well written?

GENERAL REMARKS

Ratings: Poor Fair Good Very Good Excellent Award Caliber

RESPONSE TO AUTHORS

RECOMMENDATIONS

**Please note the Presentation Preference chosen by the author before making your recommendation.

Accepted Oral - No Revisions Required. No revisions requested. Options: technical paper (appeals or benefits the readership and its theory translates into application); technical note (description of a technical issue that would not be a paper in its own right but is informative for the readership); or forum paper (non-technical opinion piece of interest to the readership).

Accepted Oral - Minor Revisions Required. Minor revisions requested. Options: technical paper (appeals or benefits the readership and its theory translates into application); technical note (description of a technical issue that would not be a paper in its own right but is informative for the readership); or forum paper (non-technical opinion piece of interest to the readership).

Conditional Acceptance Oral- Major Revisions Required. Major revisions are required and the revised paper will need to undergo further assessment.

Accepted Poster - No Revisions Required. No revisions requested. Options: technical paper (appeals or benefits the readership and its theory translates into application); technical note (description of a technical issue that would not be a paper in its own right but is informative for the readership); or forum paper (non-technical opinion piece of interest to the readership).

Accepted Poster - Minor Revisions Required. Minor revisions requested. Options: technical paper (appeals or benefits the readership and its theory translates into application); technical note (description of a technical issue that would not be a paper in its own right but is informative for the readership); or forum paper (non-technical opinion piece of interest to the readership).

Conditional Acceptance Poster - Major Revisions Required. Major revisions are required and the revised paper will need to undergo further assessment.

Do Not Accept. Paper does not meet IMPC standards. It does not appeal to or benefit the general readership of the IMPC Proceedings. Its theory does not translate into application. Options: Industry Poster.

Each decision will initiate an action within the online platform and dispatch the appropriate e-message to the submitter (eg. Accepted Oral – No Revision Required decision = Dispatch of an email to submitter confirming their submission was accepted with links to apply for Visa Letters and Preregister by May 1).

FINAL ACCEPTANCE

It is important that the organizers take the task of assessing papers very seriously. The quality of the symposium and the overall meeting relies on symposium organizers ensuring quality. Creating a session with papers of poor quality or with papers whose speakers are not likely to attend the conference to give their presentations does not demonstrate a job well done.