



ICE'2026 Conference Preparation

ICE Conference Paper & Review Process

Reviewers' Briefing

Friday 6th of March 2026



Content

The ICE Conference Paper Submission & Review Process

1. Paper submission & Template Information (Website)
2. Additional Requirements (Website)
3. ICE Recommended Paper Structure (Website)
4. ICE Review Criteria (Website)
5. ICE Review Criteria Form within Conftool 5/5 (How to fill it out)
6. ICE2026 Paper & Review Process (Textual explanation)
7. ICE2026 Paper & Review Process Flowchart (Visual representation)

1 - ICE Paper Submission (website)

Paper Submission

Papers will be selected in a double-blind refereeing process based on the submitted full papers.

Final papers should have no more than 7.000 words (max. 9 pages all inclusive) and should be in the correct format (template available below).

A submitted paper should NOT include authors' names as we conduct a double-blind review process!

The filename of submitted papers should be the following: "Contribution_nnn".pdf where "nnn" is the paper ID given in Conftool at submission.

The paper should clearly describe its purpose and relevance, reference to existing theories and related works, research methods used and major results.

Submit paper

📄 Templates

- Word template for paper submission: [Microsoft Word template](#)
- LaTeX template for paper submission: [LaTeX template](#)
- Final Submission kit (post-acceptance): [ICE 2026 Authors Kit](#)
- **Paper Sample (a paper template having the recommended paper structure)**

📄 Paper Presentation

Oral Presentation

Speakers will be allocated 20 minutes for presentation and discussion of their paper. The official language of the conference is English.

PAPERS NOT PRESENTED AT THE CONFERENCE WILL NOT BE INCLUDED IN THE CONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS.

2 - Additional Requirements (website)

- Papers will only be accepted for review on the condition that:
 - **the material is original, plagiarism-free and transparent on the eventual use of AI and contribution;**
 - **it has not been copyrighted, published, presented or is currently submitted for consideration elsewhere.**
- Based on the recommendations of the reviewers, the editorial committee allocates accepted papers for oral presentation or for poster presentations.
- All accepted, compliant and plagiarism-free accepted papers are submitted for publication in the digital conference proceedings to be available via IEEE Xplore® (with ISBN Number and DOI for the paper), only if:
 - **at least one author pays a full registration fee before the deadline;**
 - **and is presented by an author at the conference.**
- Conference content is submitted for inclusion into **IEEE Xplore Library** and other Abstracting and Indexing (A&I) databases. All A&I providers can be found here and include amongst others Scopus and Web of Science: <http://ieeauthorcenter.ieee.org/when-your-article-is-published/abstracting-indexing-ai-databases/>
- Authors of approved and selected papers will be invited to publish in special issues organized by prestigious indexed International Journals, subject to the international scientific rules for referee
 - e.g. **IEEE TEMS Management & Engineering Review (EMR) Journal.**

3 - Recommended Paper Structure (website)

The recommended paper structure is intended for easier reading and making sure reviewers will easily find out key review assessment aspects; some sub-sections may not be applicable depending on the type of study while adding other sub-section like “Identified Research Gaps” could be appropriate at the end of the section II for concluding the Literature Review.

Title

Abstract (short block of text synthesizing your paper)

I. INTRODUCTION

- A. **Context**
- B. **Motivation**
- C. **Objectives** (including the main research question)

II. EXISTING THEORIES & PREVIOUS WORK

- Final sub-section. **Identified Research Gaps**

III. METHODOLOGY

- A. **Presented study** (Research Question(s) and eventual Hypothesis and use of GenAi)
- B. **Applied Research Methods** (and eventual Research Model(s) & Instrument(s))
- C. **Data Collection** (eventual experiment-setup, sample(s), protocol, briefing of participants)
- D. **Analysis Method(s)**

IV. FINDINGS/RESULTS

- A. **Collected data**
- B. **Data Analysis**

V. DISCUSSION

- A. **Answering Research Question(s)** (eventually validated hypothesis & model)
- B. **Match and Contribution***

VI. CONCLUSION

- A. **Limitations**
- B. **Contribution** (sum-up the main findings/insights and gained new knowledge as well as how this study contributes to the progress in this research field)
- C. **Future Work/Perspectives**

Acknowledgments

References

**This particular sub-section is mandatory; authors have to explain how much their paper/study matches with and contributes to both ICE2026 Themes and Topics, and to IEEE TEMS research objectives (Addressing the Management of Emerging Technology; Providing Practical Frameworks; Analysing Implementation Challenges; Focusing on Value Creation), as this is a requirement for the publication of your paper in the IEEE Digital Library.*

4 - ICE Review Criteria (website)

Review criteria are the following:

1. The quality of the contribution to the existing body of knowledge in engineering, technology and innovation
 - C1 - **Quality of Content** (QC)
2. The contribution significance from theoretical and/or practical point of view
 - C2 - **Significance for Theory and/or Practice** (STP)
3. The scientific/innovation quality of the approach described in the article
 - C3 - **Originality and Level of Innovativeness** (OLI)
4. The relevance of the article in regards to the conference topics
 - C4 - **Thematic Relevance** (TR)
5. The redaction quality and clarity: both textual and visual understandability and readability
 - C5 - **Quality of Presentation** (QP)

5 - Review Criteria & Form in Conftool 1/5

*** Contribution of the Submission** Please provide 3 sentences outlining the main contribution of this submission.

Authors present a Digital Transformation exploratory study through a Clustering Service Platform as a practical implementation of the EU Digital Product Passport (DPP) new regulation to improve product traceability and transparency in support of the circular economy. Furthermore, authors argue that a Retrieval-Augmented Generation architecture, based on a Large Language Model toolkit, will accelerate document processing and navigation of complex EU construction regulations.

Awarding of Points Based on Various Criteria

*** C1: Quality of Content** Are the literature review, methods, results and conclusions appropriate?

QC

- 10 - Excellent work
- 08 - Good work
- 06 - Solid work
- 04 - Weak work
- 02 - Poor work
- 00 - Questionable work

*** C2: Significance to Theory and Practice** How much this paper brings a significant contribution?

STP

- 10 - Very good significance
- 08 - Good significance
- 06 - Average significance
- 04 - Low significance
- 02 - Only of marginal significance
- 00 - No significance

5 - Review Criteria & Form in Conftool 2/5

*** C3: Originality and Level of Innovativeness**

OLI

How much this paper brings an unforeseen work?

- 10 - Groundbreaking
- 08 - A pioneer work
- 06 - One step forward
- 04 - Better works on the same topic exist
- 02 - This has been said several times
- 00 - Outdated work

*** C4: Thematic Relevance for the "Call for Papers"**

TR

To what extent is this paper relevant to the main theme and topics of the ICE2026?

- 10 - Appropriate to the point
- 08 - Definitely relevant
- 06 - Close enough
- 04 - Relevance is questionable
- 02 - Not so relevant
- 00 - Definitely irrelevant

5 - Review Criteria & Form in Conftool 3/5

*** C5: Is the paper well written?** Are the title, abstract and content well written, aligned and balanced?

QP (Quality of Presentation)

- 10 - Excellently written May needs some typo corrections
- 08 - Well written
- 06 - Legible } Needs minor revisions
- 04 - Needs some revision
- 02 - Requires considerable work } Needs major revisions
- 00 - Not acceptable

Decisive Overall Recommendation = QC + STP + OLI + TR + QP

$$QC: 8 + STP: 10 + OLI: 8 + TR: 10 + QP: 10 = 46$$

*** Decisive Overall Recommendation** Overall, considering C1 to C5 grades, which quality level would you give to this paper?

- 50 10 - Very high quality (definitely accept) May needs some typo corrections
- 40 08 - High quality (accept)
- 30 06 - Average quality (probably accept) } Minor revisions
- 20 04 - Borderline quality (lean towards acceptance) Major revisions
- 10 02 - Low quality (lean towards rejection)
- 0 00 - Minor quality (definitely reject)

5 - Review Criteria & Form in Conftool 4/5

Comments on the Submission

*** Comments for the Authors** Besides highlighting strengths & weaknesses describe the needed improvements on each criterium step by step as revisions that should be implemented in the final version. For example:

C5 - Quality of presentation

Your paper's figures and tables are too small as well as all the texts; resize them properly. Your paper structure should follow the recommended one (see on the ICE2026 website) and use the proper ICE2026 paper

Main Strengths: S1: sound methodology; S2: validated claims; S3: implications

Main Weaknesses: W1: motivation is unclear; W2: missing gaps; W3: unjustified claims

C1-QC: comments; C2-STP: comments; C3-OLI: comments; C4-TR: comments; C5-QP: comments

Section I Introduction: sub-section A. Context is missing...etc...

Section II Background: conclude with identified gaps ...etc...

Section III Methodology: missing the source of collected secondary data...etc...

Section IV Findings: include a table synthesising the main results.

Section V Discussion: need to clarify the theoretical and practical implications.

Section VI Conclusion: provide your study limitations e.g. for generalisation.

Familiarity of the reviewer with the topic

- * Familiarity of the reviewer with the topic**
- 10 - Very familiar with the topic, my area of expertise
 - 08 - Good knowledge
 - 06 - More or less familiar
 - 04 - Only marginally familiar
 - 02 - Not really familiar
 - 00 - Completely new to me

5a - Review Criteria & Form in Conftool 5/5

Copy screen illustrating the case of selecting the “**Major Review Required**” checkbox and/or “**Veto Against Acceptance**” checkbox , which implies that the reviewer has to mandatorily fill out the “**Internal Comments**” frame, with the necessary explanation about the justification for selecting “Major Revision” and/or reasons & motivations justifying a veto against the acceptance of this paper.

Information for the program committee

Best Paper Award Do you think this submission is a candidate for the best paper award?

Major Revision Required This submission requires major rework before it can be accepted.

Veto Against Acceptance Do you have major objections against the acceptance of this submission?
Please explain your veto in the internal comments.

Internal comments These comments are only for the chairs and members of the program committee (PC) and will not be passed on to authors.

Authors present an exploratory study on secondary data collected by GenAI apps making difficult the claim of ...etc...; therefore, I recommend to either reject this paper or eventually request a major change before to resubmit for a second review.

Submit Review

Save as Draft

5b - Review Criteria & Form in Conftool 5/5

*Copy screen illustrating the case of selecting the “**Best Paper Award**” checkbox, which opens a specific frame to be filled out by the reviewer for explaining the reasons/motivations to nominate this paper as a candidate for the best paper award.*

Information for the program committee

Best Paper Award Do you think this submission is a candidate for the best paper award?

*** Rationale for Best Paper Award** Please provide a short explanation why this submission should be considered for the best paper award.

Major Revision Required This submission requires major rework before it can be accepted.

Veto Against Acceptance Do you have major objections against the acceptance of this submission?
Please explain your veto in the internal comments.

6 - ICE Paper & Review Process (Textual)

1. **Authors** upload their full paper (compliant with the ICE Paper Template, structure and anonymously prepared and proper filename “Contribution-*nnn*” is given by Conftool);
2. **Topic chair(s)** check the **appropriateness** of submitted papers before assigning 3 **reviewers**;
3. **Reviewers** grade/rate their assigned papers accordingly to the review instructions, assessment criteria and provide recommendations to authors for improvement of their paper;
4. **Review decisions, comments & recommendations** are conveyed to **authors** through (1) Conftool Bulk email and (2) automatically appear in authors’ space on Conftool platform;
5. **Authors** prepare and upload their final version accordingly to reviewers' recommendations (PDF file generated after changes made in MS Word Track Change Mode colour; for Latex changed text in red) with changes explanation given through the Conftool **Rebuttal** feature;
6. **Topic chair(s)** inform assigned **reviewers** about uploaded authors’ final version for checking whether their recommendations were properly implemented; in case of remaining issue(s), **reviewers** inform **Topic chair(s)** asking **authors** to rework revisions and resubmit;
7. **Authors** are duly **notified on the acceptance of their final version** and whether they can go to the two next steps for publication;
8. **Authors** apply the **IEEE Express PDF checker** to their final version in order to get the IEEE green light for publication;
9. **Authors** have to **fill out and sign the copyrights transfer to IEEE** and upload it on ConfTool;
10. **Publication chair(s)** prepare the **publication package** of presented accepted papers.

7 - ICE Paper & Review Process (Flowchart)

