Review Criteria for ICAITD 2026 **Jan. 1 2026**

ICAITD Committee
Algorithm_Lab.
Kazuo Ohzeki

The following three points will be evaluated during the peer review process:
1. Novelty and Originality: Presentation of new insights, discoveries, or new research methods that have not been seen before. Comparison with previous papers.
2. Accuracy: The conclusions must be logically derived based on objective data and using correct research methods.
3. Clarity: The argument must be clear and written in a format that can be understood by a third party.

On the other hand, usefulness/effectiveness and relevance/importance will not be evaluated. The reason is as follows:
4. Usefulness/Effectiveness: This is something that will be clarified over time in society after future practical application research and implementation, and considering it during the paper review process could lead to bias.
5. Relevance: This is a matter of the requirements of the academic society to which the paper is submitted, and is in conflict with novel and original research; considering it may negatively affect the evaluation of value.

---------- - -

Novelty and Originality:
Comparison and Evaluation Criteria for Novelty and Originality:
Novelty refers to something unprecedented in the past, while originality refers to the author's internal uniqueness, such as their thoughts and ideas, or an idea that combines existing technologies and concepts.
However, there are many similarities, and the criterion for evaluation is whether something new is presented compared to previous examples. Focusing only on internal aspects can lead to speculation, so make sure these aspects are clearly expressed.

Criteria for the content of the paper

(1) Peer Review Items:
(1-1) [Summary]
Is the outline of the content and the overall structure of the paper logical and clear?

Quality of English: Are there any grammatical errors?
(1-2) [Strength / Reason to Accept]: Is the originality or novelty explained and clarified? (Is this original research that brings new insights and contributions to the field?)
(1-3) [Weakness / Reason to Reject]: Equal to or worse than existing research, errors, logical inconsistencies, etc.
(1-4) [Questions for the Authors]: Write these as conditions for conditional acceptance.
(1-5) Assign an overall score: A score based on originality or novelty, not a subjective score.
The average of these scores will be used primarily to determine acceptance, with the others serving as a reference.
(1-6) Others

(2) Methodology/Technical Soundness
(2-1) Are the research methods and experimental design appropriate, rigorous, accurate, and verifiable?
(2-2) For software simulation experiments, we recommend making the data and code public and publishing them on GitHub.
[[Research using generative AI often involves detailed experiments, so be sure to provide as much information as possible about the data, program code, and environment so that reviewers can easily replicate them. Peer review takes time, so if verification information is insufficient and verification is difficult, the paper may be left pending and rejected.]]
(2-3) Are sufficient data and evidence presented to support a conclusion?
(3) Validity/Interpretation of Results
(3-1) Are the presented results accurate and reliable?
(3-2) Are the interpretations and discussion of the results logical and persuasive?

(4) Compliance
(4-1) Are there any issues with research ethics?
Are there any conflicts of interest? All co-authors must disclose any actual or perceived conflicts of interest.

Other:
We emphasize objective evaluation of novelty, disregarding conformity to established academic frameworks. Rather, we emphasize the possibility of novel research that breaks with existing frameworks. Furthermore, emphasizing a topic that resonates with the reviewer's research can be subjective and personal, requiring reviewers to have the mental fortitude to overcome such constraints.

We emphasize quality, eliminating the acceptance rate as a criterion for acceptance and not worrying about fluctuations in the number of accepted papers. We treat papers with absolute evaluation criteria.

A full paper will be accepted if it contains one or more novel features. However, for example, a paper that "makes detailed case studies, explores untested combinations, and logically determines their validity using statistical methods" may not be considered groundbreaking research that brings new insights or contributes to the field. In such cases, points may be deducted due to the lack of novelty or the existence of similar research.

The requirement for one or more novel features is intended to prevent a paper from being rejected in the academic world due to its divergence from established frameworks or for being outside the field. For example, there are cases in which Nobel Prize winners have had their early research papers on their awards rejected.
There are three types of acceptance: accepted, conditionally accepted, and rejected. Incomplete descriptions, insufficient English expression, misprints, etc. are considered conditionally accepted, and revisions are encouraged. Papers that are too long or have a different style are acceptable. If they are too long, revisions can be requested.

---------- - -