IMS2024 Double-Blind Reviewing Policy

IMS2024 will continue the double-blind reviewing policy used since IMS2011. A double-blind review process provides 'anonymity' for both authors and reviewers. As the reviewers will not be informed of the authors' names or affiliations in the submitted paper, such information must be removed from the paper before submission. A double-blind review process is intended to eliminate any perception of bias for or against an author or institution based on name recognition, country, gender, or other characteristics. This helps assure authors of the following:

- All submitted papers are judged equally, based on established evaluation criteria.
- The content and quality of submitted papers are judged, and not the authors or their affiliations.

Beyond the obvious need to remove names and affiliations, there are a number of additional changes required to prepare a paper for a double-blind review. For example, citation of prior work is required to evaluate a submission. Referencing the authors' own work should be worded in a way that avoids identifying connections to the authors. Simply note your prior work in the same way as work by others. For example, do not write "We demonstrated in [2] that …" Rather, write "It was demonstrated in [2] that…" The author must take every possible step to make the submission anonymous and avoid identification by inference. To make the process as simple as possible we can reduce the procedure to just a few steps shown below. Papers submitted to IMS2024 that disregard these double-blind review requirements will not be reviewed.

1. Eliminate author names, contact information, and affiliations from the title and anywhere else;
2. Eliminate acknowledgments and references to funding sources;
3. Use the third person to refer to the authors' own work;
4. Ensure figures do not contain any affiliation-related identifier (e.g. logos on hardware or in IC layouts);
5. Depersonalize the work by using anonymous text where necessary;
6. Remove or depersonalize citations to authors' unpublished work;
7. Remove references to patents filed by authors or their institutions.

One of the most common misunderstandings of the double-blind review policy concerns the reference list at the end of the paper. The table below illustrates the correct and incorrect way of handling this, assuming that J. A. Doe and J. B. Doe are the names of you and your co-author:

Correct handling of cited references	**Incorrect way of handling cited references**
"This paper builds on the previous research of [2] by highlighting some of the recent advances…" [2] J. A. Doe and J. B. Doe, "Previous research: a review," in *2014 Int. Conf. on Writing Conf. Papers*, Luckenbach, TX, USA, Jun. 2014, pp. 1721–1734. Use anonymous, third-person language when referring to your own work. Do not redact any references, including your own.	"In this paper, we build on our previous research [2] and highlight some of the recent advances…" [2] (Redacted – double blind), "Previous research: a review," in *2014 Int. Conf. on Writing Conf. Papers*, Luckenbach, TX, USA, Jun. 2014, pp. 1721–1734. Do not use first-person language such as "we" and "our" when referring to your own work. Do not redact any references, including your own.

For additional examples of how to avoid double-blind violations, refer to the *"Recent Advances in Eliminating Double-Blind Violations in Conference Papers,"* authored by Ryan Gough of the IMS2017 Steering Committee.