

INCOSE IS | SUBMISSION REVIEW PROCESS FOR PRESENTATIONS ONLY

Proposed Criteria

Reviewers will score each abstract submission, based on the guiding questions in each section, using the following criteria/instructions. Note: presentations will not be reviewed at this stage.

Submissions in this track are evaluated from a longer abstract (up to 600 words) rather than a full paper. Reviewers should expect the underlying work to be conceptual, early-stage, or still in progress, and should evaluate the idea's promise, clarity, and direction rather than expecting the methodological detail or validation required for a full paper submission. This track does not distinguish between research-oriented and practice-oriented submissions; the same criteria apply to both.

Originality

Please assess whether this abstract proposes/explores new insights into solutions to SE challenges. You may use the following questions as a guide in your evaluation process for the originality of the work proposed in this abstract:

- Do the author(s) discuss new insights into existing theory, methods, processes, tools, and/or practice?
- Do the author(s) make a case for why their insights can be leveraged to attain solutions to SE challenges?
- Will attendees of INCOSE IS and readers of the proceedings learn something that they didn't already know from this submission?

SCORING GRADES

Please select the option that best describes the originality of this abstract:

1 Not at all Original - This particular work has already been sufficiently addressed by the community.

2 Low Originality - This work presents a small incremental improvement over existing published work.

3 Minor Improvement - The same problem has been examined before, but this presentation presents a new approach or data that has not yet been presented.

4 Major Improvement - This work represents a significant expansion of a previously investigated topic and offers a potential path towards attaining solutions to an SE challenge.

5 New/Novel Approach - This work presents a promising and/or potential new approach to addressing SE challenges; examples include a dramatically different idea, methodology, tool, or approach; or provides a very promising approach at attaining solutions to SE challenges.

Relevance

Please assess how relevant this submission is to INCOSE IS. You may use the following questions as a guide in your evaluation process for the relevance to INCOSE IS of the work presented in this abstract:

- Is the work proposed in the abstract related to the disciplinary areas identified in the SEBoK, INCOSE Handbook, FuSE, TechOps, INCOSE initiatives, and/or of interest to SE?
- Is this submission, based on what the abstract depicts and regardless of its quality, better suited to other events or publication channels?

Note: If you mark this category low, please provide suggested alternative events or publication channels (or at least the appropriate topic area) in the comments area.

SCORING GRADES

Please select the option that best describes the relevance of this abstract to INCOSE IS:

1 Not at all Relevant - The topic falls outside systems engineering and does not belong at INCOSE IS.

2 Low Relevance - The connection to systems engineering or INCOSE IS's disciplinary areas is weak or tangential.

3 Borderline Relevance - The submission touches on systems engineering but is only loosely connected to INCOSE IS's disciplinary areas, or may be a better fit for another venue or publication channel.

4 Relevant - The submission is clearly connected to INCOSE IS's disciplinary areas and would be of interest to its attendees.

5 Very Relevant - The submission addresses a disciplinary area central to INCOSE IS and would be highly welcomed by attendees and the broader INCOSE community.

Contribution

Please assess if the author, via the abstract, proposes a novel/relevant contribution to systems engineering. This criterion evaluates the significance of the idea's potential contribution, why it matters, as distinct from Originality, which evaluates whether the idea itself is new. Because this is an early-stage abstract, focus on the idea's promise and potential impact rather than requiring a fully developed or validated methodology. You may use the following questions as a guide in your evaluation process for the contribution of the work proposed in this abstract:

- Do the author(s) make a compelling case for how their presentation may contribute to INCOSE's Vision 2035 or other needs of SE?
- Would this presentation be stimulating to attendees and worth attending — is it likely to generate discussion or engagement at the symposium?
- Are contributions clearly defined?

SCORING GRADES

Please select the option that best describes the contribution level of this abstract to INCOSE IS:

1 Little to no contribution of value - This particular idea has already been sufficiently addressed by the community.

2 Some minor contributions - This idea presents a small incremental addition to existing published work.

3 Minor Improvement - The same problem has been examined before, but this abstract proposes a new angle, approach, or data that has not yet been presented.

4 Major Improvement - This idea represents a significant expansion of a previously investigated topic, with clear potential value to SE even if not yet fully developed.

5 New/Novel - This is a new topic, direction, or promising idea in this area — even if the methodology or approach is not yet fully developed or validated.

Acceptance

Please indicate if this abstract should be accepted for presentation at INCOSE IS.

This is an international symposium; as such, many authors have English as a second language. Please indicate in the comments section if you identify accessibility issues.

Scoring Guide

Please select the option that best describes your assessment below:

Note: If you suggest moving the abstract and subsequent presentation to another topical area, please indicate the domain you think would be the best fit below.

5 Definitely Accept - It meets all criteria (in some cases exceeding some) evaluated in this form.

4 Probably Accept - It meets most criteria in this form.

3 Borderline Accept/Reject - It fails to meet a few criteria in this form.

2 Weak Reject - It does not meet many criteria and/or may not be a good fit to INCOSE IS.

1 Do Not Accept - It does not meet any criteria in this form and/or is not a good fit to INCOSE IS.

Confidence

As a reviewer, how confident were you within the knowledge area discussed in this submission?

5 Very Confident - I am an expert in this topic.

4 Confident - I am well versed in this topic.

3 Some Confidence - I have some experience in this topic.

2 Low Confidence - I am vaguely familiar with this topic.

1 No Confidence - I am not familiar with this topic.