It is required that you **rate all submissions out of 5** in terms of quality (with 5 being the highest) and you should also provide some brief (1-2 sentence per criterion) written feedback. This feedback will be particularly useful if you think a submission should not be accepted or is borderline, as it will help with making a final decision on whether the submission should be accepted. Please consider the following points when giving feedback:

- Feedback for accepted papers helps to ensure that those papers presented will be of high quality and feedback for rejected papers helps the authors to understand this outcome and improve in future.
- This feedback may be shared with all authors, so please make sure it is appropriate for them. Remember though that your name as the reviewer will remain anonymous.

These are the criteria that Reviewers are asked to use when evaluating submissions

Depending on the submission type, not all criteria will be relevant. For symposia, it is important that there is a coherent theme across all papers, and that the abstracts for the individual papers within the symposium are of acceptable quality. For 'work in progress' submissions we do not necessarily expect data to have been collected or analysed at the point of submission and indeed the work could still be in the design phase. If data have not been collected however, we would still expect clear information to be communicated regarding intended sample size, proposed methods of data collection and a clear plan of analysis, as well as a brief statement of the expected or potential implications of the research.

WRITTEN QUALITY	Is the submission suitably structured, clear, succinct, complete, well-expressed, grammatically sound, free of spelling, typographical and other errors and free of inappropriate (e.g., sexist) language? Do the authors include all requested sections, and is the content of each section adequate? (Poorly written abstracts reflect poorly not only on the presenter, but also on our profession, as they are available to conference delegates as well as online to non-delegates).
SUITABILITY FOR CYBER PSYCHOLOGY CONFERENCE	Is the submission positive and forward-looking, with a clear link to the proposed theme (if applicable)? Would delegates attending this session find it particularly interesting and thought-provoking? Is it easily accessible to people who are not specialists in the topic area?
OVERALL QUALITY	Overall, is the submission of sufficient quality to merit inclusion in the conference programme? The following questions may be useful in determining your judgement here: Does the submission advance psychological and/ or scientific knowledge and understanding? Does it advance professional skills? Is it novel and interesting? Are potential implications for practice/policy/wider society clearly articulated? Are the aims of the presentation(s) and/or scientific studies clear? Is the material to be presented adequately underpinned by theory if appropriate? In the case of empirical work or literature reviews, is the methodology sound? Are the conclusions justified given the material presented in the other sections?