

CALL FOR PAPERS

The 4th International Conference on Engineering and Meta-Engineering: ICEME 2013

in the context of

The 4th International Multi-Conference on Complexity, Informatics and Cybernetics: IMCIC 2013

March 19 - 22, 2013 ~ Orlando, Florida USA.

<http://www.iiis2013.org/iceme/>

Program Committee Chairs: Jorge Baralt and Hsing-Wei Chu

General Chair: Nagib Callaos

Organizing Committee Chairs: José Ferrer and Andrés Tremante

Conference's Major Themes

Meta- Engineering

- Meta-Engineering Science and Engineering Philosophy
- Meta-Engineering Technologies
- Meta-Engineering Praxis

Engineering

- Engineering Concepts, relations and Methodologies
- Technological development and Innovation
- Disciplinary Research

Program Committee

The Program Committee has about 65 members, who are complemented by about 1.448 reviewers, from about 96 countries. The names, affiliations and countries of the PC's members as well as the additional reviewers could be found at the Conference's web site, or more specifically at www.iiis2013.org/iceme/PCCommitte.asp.

Virtual Participation

Given the Global Recession, and thinking of those scholars, researchers and professionals related with the conference topics but unable to attend it personally (usually due to insufficient funding for the traveling costs) a **Virtual Participation** mode has been established, with the same peer reviewing and validity than face-to-face ones.

Submissions made for Virtual Participation would go through the same reviewing processes of the regular papers (double-blind, non-blind, and participative peer reviewing) and, if accepted (according to the same

acceptance policy), they will be included in the proceedings and will be eligible for journal publication, **with no additional cost**, if they are, according to their reviewers, among the best 10%-20% of those physically and virtually presented at the conference.

Each regular session, included in the conference program, will be associated to a corresponding **virtual session** where all final versions of the articles to be presented will be displayed and authors can comment them via electronic forums. Registered authors of virtual participations will have access to all conference program sessions (and papers). Their article will be displayed as the regular ones. Virtual authors also have the option of sending, besides the final version of their article in a PDF document, an electronic presentation (PowerPoint, flash, etc. and/or a 15-20 minutes video)

After paying the respective shipping and handling costs, registered authors of virtual participation, who have paid their registration fee, can get delivered the same conference material that the regular attendees receive at the registration desk.

Ways of Participation and Support

Participation in the conference could be done by means of one or several of the following activities:

- The submission of a paper/abstract.
- The organization of Invited Session(s)
- Tutorial proposals
- The organization of Focus Symposium.
- The reviewing process.
- The conference promotion.
- Recommending scholars/researchers in order to have an active participation and/or submit the papers.
- Panel Presentation.

- Proposing Organizations/Institutes/Universities as Academic/Scientific Co-Sponsors.

Kinds of Participants

Participation of both, researchers and practitioners is strongly encouraged. Papers may be submitted on: research in science and engineering, case studies drawn on professional practice and consulting, and position papers based on large and rich experience gained through executive/managerial practices and decision-making. Hence, the Program Committee has been conformed according to the criteria given above.

Deadlines

December 04th, 2012: Submission of draft papers (2000-5000), extended abstracts (400-2000) and abstracts for inter-disciplinary communication (200-600 words)

December 04th, 2012: Invited Sessions proposals. Acceptance of invited session proposals will be done in about one week of its proposal via the respective conference web form, and final approval will be done after the inclusion of at least five papers in the respective session

December 27th, 2012: Notifications of acceptance.

January 11th, 2013: Submission of camera-ready or final versions of the accepted papers.

March 19th, 2013: Conference Starts

March 22nd, 2013: Conference Ends

Some invited sessions might have a different timetable according to its organizer and chair, but in any case the camera ready deadline should be met.

Types of Submissions Accepted

1. **Papers/Abstracts**
 - **Research** papers
 - a. in **science**
 - b. in **engineering**, including systems analysis, design, implementation, synthesis, deployment, maintenance, etc.
 - **Review** papers
 - **Case** studies
 - **Position** papers
 - **Reports:** technical reports, engineering reports, reports on a methodological application, etc.
2. **Invited Sessions**
Data regarding invited session to be organized by the submitter (title of the invited session, name of the organizer, affiliation, titles of the papers accepted for the invited session, authors' names, etc.). More details could be found below or at the conference web site.
3. **Panel Presentation and/or Round Table Proposals.** Panel or round table proposals can be made using the web page related to invited sessions proposals.
4. **Focus Symposia** (which should include a minimum of 15 papers). Focus symposia

proposals can be made using the web page related to invited sessions proposals.

5. **Tutorial or workshop presentation**, which can be proposed sending an email to iceme@mail.iiis2013.org

Three Kinds of Reviewing Processes

Draft papers and abstracts will have three kinds of reviewing: double-blind, non-blind and participatory reviewing:

1. Each submission will be sent to at least three reviewers, randomly selected, from the Program Committee's members and from the additional reviewers, for its double-blind reviewing.
2. Draft papers and extended abstracts will also have non-blind, open reviewing by means of 1-3 reviewers suggested by the submitting authors. The author(s) of each submitted paper/abstract should nominate at least one or two reviewers (accordingly to the submission option selected), and can nominate a maximum of three reviewers for the non-blind review of their respective submitted paper/abstract.
3. Submissions will also be included in a Participative Peer-to-Peer Reviewing (PPPR). Consequently, submissions will be posted, without previous screening, in the conference web site in a way that it could be accessed, reviewed, commented and evaluated by the authors who sent draft papers or abstracts in the same area or topic. Authors will get a login and a password in order to have this kind of access. Details related to the Participative Peer-to-Peer Reviewing (PPPR), as well as the reasoning supporting it can be found at <http://www.iiis2013.org/iceme/Website/Pptpr.asp?vc=32>

Acceptance of a submitted paper will be based on all kinds of reviewing, but the first two (double-blind and non-blind) will be necessary conditions for draft papers and extended abstracts.

The selection of the best 10%-20% papers, for their publication in the Journal of Systemics, Cybernetics and Informatics (JSCI), will also be done based on the three kinds of reviewing.

Several studies have shown the strength and the weaknesses of double-blind and non-blind methods of reviewing. Many editors and authors also addressed this issue, some of whom have concluded that the reviewing should be double blinded and some others reached the opposite conclusion. David Kaplan, a highly cited author for example, stated that to overcome the weaknesses of peer-reviewing and to fix it "Review of a manuscript would be solicited from colleagues by the authors. The first task of these reviewers would be to identify revisions that could be made to improve the manuscript. Second, the reviewers would be responsible for writing an

evaluation of the revised work.” (Kaplan D., 2005, “How to Fix Peer Review”, *The Scientist*, Volume 19, Issue 1, Page 10, Jun. 6. Also in www.scienceboard.org/community/perspectives.142.html)

Since both of these reviewing methods are opposites without contradiction between them, both methods can be used in a way as to complement one another, getting their advantages and reducing their respective disadvantages. This is the aim of ICEME 2010’s Organizing Committee while choosing to combine both of them in the reviewing process of the papers that are submitted to the conference.

A Multi-Methodological Approach for Reviewing Submissions sent to a Multi- and Inter-Disciplinary Conference

Considering the multi- and inter-disciplinary nature of ICEME 2013 and the fact that there are different kinds of epistemological values, disciplinary rigors, reviewing standards, and conference organizational models, the ICEME 2010’s Organizing Committee considered as highly desirable to have different kinds of submissions to the conference with different methods of their respective reviewing. Accordingly, submissions of draft papers will be differentiated from abstracts’ submissions. Each kind of submission will have two different reviewing methods as well. Consequently, authors will have the opportunity to choose the way of submitting their paper that best fits their disciplinary rigor and their organization’s requirements with regards to the conference organizational model. In any kind of submission **authors should clearly indicate the contribution made by them.**

Accordingly, there will be different reviewing methods, going from the most formal one, to less formal methods followed by those who conceive the knowledge communication made through conferences as a more informal process. Consequently, authors will have different ways of making their submissions, and these ways will be highly related to different conference organizational models followed by prestigious scholar societies or suggested by highly cited authors.

Three kinds of reviewing processes will be applied to submissions made for their (face-to-face or virtual) presentation at the conference and their inclusion in the hard copy and CD version of the conference proceedings. These three kinds are: 1) double-blinded reviews; 2) open, non-blind reviews; and 3) participative peer-to-peer reviews by authors who made submissions to the same topic or area in the conference.

Types of submissions accepted

Authors have there are 3 submission options to be considered for face-to-face presentations and 3 similar options for submissions to be considered for virtual presentations. These options are the following:

FA. Full Draft papers (2000-5000 words) submitted for their presentation at the conference and for inclusion in the conference proceedings, in their hard copy and CD versions. This kind of submissions will be reviewed by a **Modified Kaplan’s Method**, where the submission’s author should suggest at least two scholars, researchers and/or professionals for the **open, non-blind** review of his/her paper. Each paper will also be sent to at least 3 reviewers for its **double-blind** review as well. Acceptance decisions will be based on both kinds of reviews: Non-blind and double-blind ones. [David Kaplan’s article titled “How to fix Peer Review” (The Scientist, Volume 19, Issue 1, Page 10, Jun. 6, 2005) can also be accessed at <http://www.scienceboard.net/community/perspectives.142.html>]

FB. Extended abstracts (600-200 words, not a full paper) submitted for presentation at the conference and for inclusion in the conference proceedings, in their hard copy and CD versions. Authors submitting **Extended Abstracts** should suggest at least one scholar, researcher, or professional for the **open, non-blind** review of his/her abstract. Each extended abstract will also be sent to at least three reviewers for its **double-blind** reviewing as well. Acceptance decisions will be based on both kinds of reviewing: Non-blind and double-blind ones. **“The submission should contain a scholar [or a professional] exposition of ideas, techniques, and results, including motivation and a clear comparison with related work.”** (as it is indicated for submissions to be made to the Annual IEEE Symposia on Foundations of Computer Science: FOCS).

FC. Abstracts, written for Inter-Disciplinary Communication (300-600 words), may be submitted for presentation at the conference and for inclusion in the conference proceedings, in their hard copy and CD versions. The purpose the Organizing Committee seeks by allowing this kind of submissions is to foster communications among different knowledge domains, different disciplines, and different kinds of experiences, as for example between academic and corporate knowledge/experience. Authors submitting abstracts for Inter-Disciplinary Communication should write both, the abstract and the full paper in a way as to be understood by scholars from other disciplines, i.e. they should be written in non-technical, non-disciplinary terms, and should clearly state the contributions the authors are making in their respective disciplinary or interdisciplinary field, and/or the potential impact of the article’s content in other disciplines. Analogical thinking is suggested for these articles as complement of the usual logical-disciplinary one. Consequently, this kind of articles may contain inter-disciplinary analogies, expressional metaphors, analogical inferences, communicational analogies, analogy-based hypothesis formulations, design proposals, etc.

Authors submitting **Abstracts** may suggest 1-3 scholars, researchers, or professionals for open, non-

blind reviewing of their respective abstract. Each abstract will also be sent to at least three reviewers for its double-blind reviewing as well. Acceptance decisions will be based on both kinds of reviewing: non-blind and double-blind. The submission should be similar to the abstracts or introductions usually written at the beginning of a full paper, containing “a scholarly [or a professional] exposition of ideas, techniques, and results, including motivation and a clear comparison with related work” (as it is indicated for submissions to be made to the Annual IEEE Symposia on Foundations of Computer Science: FOCS).

VA. Full Draft papers (2000-5000 words) submitted for **Virtual Participation** at the conference and for inclusion in the conference proceedings, in their hard copy and CD versions. Similarly to the face-to-face option above (indicated as FA), “this kind of submissions will be reviewed by a **Modified Kaplan's Method**, where the submission's author should suggest at least two scholars, researchers and/or professionals for the **open, non-blind** review of his/her paper. Each paper will also be sent to at least 3 reviewers for its **double-blind** review as well. Acceptance decisions will be based on both kinds of reviews: Non-blind and double-blind ones. [David Kaplan's article titled “How to fix Peer Review” (The Scientist, Volume 19, Issue 1, Page 10, Jun. 6, 2005) can also be accessed at <http://www.scienceboard.net/community/perspectives.142.html>.]”

VB. Extended abstracts (600-2000 words, not a full paper) submitted for **Virtual Participation** at the conference and for inclusion in the conference proceedings, in their hard copy and CD versions. Similarly to the face-to-face option above (indicated as FB), “authors submitting **Extended Abstracts** should suggest at least one scholar, researcher, or professional for the **open, non-blind** review of his/her abstract. Each extended abstract will also be sent to at least three reviewers for its **double-blind** reviewing as well. Acceptance decisions will be based on both kinds of reviewing: Non-blind and double-blind ones. **“The submission should contain a scholar [or a professional] exposition of ideas, techniques, and results, including motivation and a clear comparison with related work”** (as it is indicated for submissions to be made to the Annual IEEE Symposia on Foundations of Computer Science: FOCS).”

VC. Abstracts, written for Inter-Disciplinary Communication (300-600 words), submitted for **Virtual Participation** at the conference and their inclusion in the conference proceedings, in for hard copy and CD versions. Similarly to the face-to-face option above (indicated as FC), “the purpose the Organizing Committee seeks by allowing this kind of submissions is to foster communications among different knowledge domains, different disciplines, and different kinds of experiences, as for example

between academic and corporate knowledge/experience. Authors submitting abstracts for Inter-Disciplinary Communication should write both, the abstract and the full paper in a way as to be understood by scholars from other disciplines, i.e. they should be written in non-technical, non-disciplinary terms, and should clearly state the contributions the authors are making in their respective disciplinary or interdisciplinary field, and/or the potential impact of the article's content in other disciplines. Analogical thinking is suggested for these articles as complement of the usual logical-disciplinary one. Consequently, this kind of articles may contain inter-disciplinary analogies, expressional metaphors, analogical inferences, communicational analogies, analogy-based hypothesis formulations, design proposals, etc.

Acceptance policy

The acceptance policy which is usually applied to the submissions made to ICEME, the symposia organized in its context, the collocated Conferences and other conferences organized by the International Institute of Informatics and Systemics (IIS), is oriented by:

- A. The **majority rule**, when there is no agreement among the reviewers with regards to acceptance or non-acceptance, of a given submission.
- B. The non-acceptance of the submission when there is agreement among its reviewers for not accepting it.
- C. Acceptance of the paper when in doubt (a draw or a tie among the opinions of the reviewers, for example).

The reasoning that is supporting this acceptance policy is based on very well established facts:

- There usually is a low level agreement among reviewers
- A significant probability of refusing high quality papers when the acceptance policy is oriented in such a way as to just accept those papers with no disagreement for their respective acceptance.
- The possible plagiarism (of some non-ethical reviewer) of the content of non-accepted papers.

Details regarding the reasoning supporting this acceptance policy are given in the conference web site.

Submitted papers/abstracts will be sent to reviewers. The best 10% of the papers will also be published in the Journal of Systemics, Cybernetics and Informatics (JSCI). Acceptance decisions regarding papers presentation at the conference, and their respective inclusion in the conference's proceedings, will be based on their content review and/or on the respective author's CV. Invited papers will not be reviewed and their acceptance decision will be based on the topic and the respective author's CV. Some of these invited papers, if chosen by the session chair as the best paper of the session, might also be published by JSCI Journal, because the 30% of sessions best papers will also be published in the journal. All accepted papers, which should not exceed six single-spaced typed pages, will be published by means of paper and electronic proceedings.

Reviewing of papers submitted to invited session organizers

Organizers of invited sessions are autonomous with regards to the reviewing method to be used in the reviewing process of the papers to be submitted to their respective sessions. They can use any of the methods described above, or some combination of them.

In some cases, like it is the case of Invited Papers, the CVs of the authors will also support the decision regarding the acceptance, or non-acceptance, of the respective paper.

Organizers of the best invited sessions or focus symposia will co-edit the respective proceedings volume, the CD version of the proceedings and might be invited to be invited editors or co-editors of the JSCI Journal issue where their session or symposia papers will be published. Multiple author books, or JSCI journal issues, might be published by IIIS, based on the best-invited sessions, the best focus symposia or the best mini-conferences, and the topic of the papers.

Reviewers not meeting the reviewing deadline

If the reviewers selected for reviewing a given paper/abstract do not make their respective reviews before the papers/abstracts acceptance deadline, the selection committee may inform the respective author about this fact.

Reviewing of papers and abstract other than research full papers

The reviewing process of abstracts, case studies, position papers, reports, white papers, panel presentations and round table proposals will be based on the relevance of the topic, its potential for interdisciplinary communications, its educational value and/or its analogical thinking potential.

Papers to be included in the conference proceedings

Accepted papers that have at least one of their authors with a confirmed registration status in the conference, for **face-to-face or virtual presentation**, will be included in both versions of the conference proceedings (hardcopy and CD). Papers received after the respective deadline may be included in the post-conference proceedings volume. Any error that results in the non-inclusion of a paper that should have been included in the proceedings will be corrected including such a paper in the post-conference proceedings volume.

Paper to be included, later, in the Journal JSCI

Each accepted paper or presentation is candidate for being a best paper of its respective session and, consequently, it is candidate for a second reviewing

process to be made by the reviewers of the Journal of Systemics, Cybernetics and Informatics (JSCI), for its possible inclusion among the best 10%-20% papers presented at the conference which will be selected and published in the JSCI, after doing possible modifications (in content/format) and extensions as to adequate them to a journal publication.

Submission of Draft Papers and Abstracts

Abstracts or draft papers should be submitted taking into account the following format:

1. Each submission should be related to at least one of the major themes, or the special symposia, given above.
2. Each submission should have a title.
3. Abstracts for interdisciplinary communications should have 200 to 600 words, extended abstracts should have 400 to 2000 words and draft papers should have 2000 to 5000 words, in English.
4. Author(s) with names, addresses, telephone and fax numbers, and e-mail addresses should be included.
5. Each author making a submission should necessarily suggest at least one or two (accordingly to the submission option selected) and a maximum of three reviewers for the open review of the submitted extended abstract or paper draft, according to the acceptance policy stated above.

Abstracts or draft papers should be sent via the conference web site <http://www.iiis2013.org/iceme/Submission.asp>, filling the respective form and uploading the respective paper or abstract. If the conference web site is not accessible for you, you can also make your submission by e-mail, attaching it to the following e-mail address: iceme@mail.iiis2013.org

Conference Fees

The registration fee for IIIS' members (<http://www.iiis.org>) will be \$590 before their Camera Ready deadline and \$640 after their Camera Ready deadline. Additional \$50 applies for non-members of IIIS.

Full-time students at academic institutions will have a discount of \$100 off the registration fee indicated above. This discount applies only to the registration fee. To qualify for the discounted fee, students must provide, via fax or postal mail, an official certification issued by their university or institution verifying they are full-time students and a copy of their valid Student ID card. Full-time students that register at the conference must have both forms of verification with them when they arrive at the registration desk.

Authors of papers accepted for their respective presentation at ICEME 2013, or any of the symposia organized in its context or any of the collocated conferences, may apply for a complimentary, free IIIS membership at <http://www.iiis2013.org/iceme/Website/IIISMembers.asp?vc=32> after getting the acceptance e-mail related

to the presentation of their paper and before making their registration in the conference, so they can register with the reduced fee.

Each registration fee entitles the publication and presentation of one paper of up to 6 pages. The registered author may include one additional paper (of up to 6 pages and authored by him/her) at an extra charge of \$300. The additional paper must be authored and presented by the registered author.

If two or more authors of the same paper attend the conference, each of them must pay his/her respective registration fee in full.

There is a limit of 6 pages for each paper in the Proceedings. At most 2 additional pages can be included, as long as the registered author pays the fee of US\$ 75.00 per extra page.

This fee will include exclusively:

- A CD-ROM version of the proceedings
- One volume of the hard copy version of the conference proceedings. (If you are an author, you will receive the volume in which your paper was published).
- Coffee breaks
- Welcome Reception

Any other expenses must be afforded by the participants.

The registration fee does not include any post-conference services. There will be additional shipping and handling costs to be paid by those registered authors who, for unforeseen reasons, cannot attend ICEME 2012 and will ask us to send them the proceedings after the conference. Any other post-conference administrative requirements will be charged at a rate of US\$20 per staff hour required to elaborate such a requirement, with a minimum of US\$10. Post-conference requirements will have their own deadline, which, in no case, will be more than four (4) months counted from the last day of the conference.

Invited Sessions

Invited sessions' organizers are autonomous in the promotion of their respective session as well as in collecting, reviewing and selecting the papers to be presented at their respective sessions.

An invited session organizer has a similar role to the invited editor in a journal, i.e. he or she is invited to identify and look for high quality papers, to review the papers of his, or her, session, to select the reviewers that will help him, or her, and to decide which papers he/she wants to be presented at respective invited session.

The invitation is an academic, not a financial one, because, unfortunately, we have no financial sponsor and the conference should self-finance itself.

Consequently, we cannot make any financial commitment.

Invited sessions and symposia organizers with the best performance will be co-editors of the proceedings volume where their session or symposia paper were included.

Chairs of invited sessions will select the best paper presented at their session. Sessions' best papers will be reviewed by reviewers of the Journal of Systemics, Cybernetics, and Informatics (JSCI) in order to select the best 30% of them for their respective publications in the Journal.

Best invited sessions and symposia organizers are candidates for invited editors or co-editors of the JSCI Journal special issue related to their field of research interest.

Details with regards to the role of invited session organizers and to suggested steps that they might make in organizing their respective sessions are given in the conference web site.

Guidelines for Reviewers (and authors)

The Golden Rule "*Treat others as you would like to be treated*", apply very well for the most general and essential guidelines for reviewers. Siegelman (1988) adapted this golden rule of the Ethics of Reciprocity in what might be called the Golden Rule of Reviewing. He stated "*Referee manuscript as you would like to have your own papers treated*" (Siegelman, advice to authors. Radiology 1988; 166:278-280; in Weller, 2002, *Editorial Peer Review, its Strength and Weaknesses*, Medford, New Jersey).

"The Golden Rule" is an essential moral principle found in almost all major religious and cultures. It has been conceived as the most essential basis for the modern concept of human right. Principal philosophers and religious figures have stated it in different ways. At www.religioustolerance.org/reciproc.htm, for example, versions of the Golden Rule in 21 world religions are quoted. Analogously we might conceive Siegelman's Reviewing Golden Rule as an essential rule that can be applied to virtually all reviewing processes and methods in spite of their high diversity and the variety of their ends and means.

To be more specific, with regards to some guidelines for reviewers, would depend on the objectives sought by the reviewing process and on its inherent limitations and restrictions. Different editorial objectives, for example, would probably originate different guidelines. Different disciplines with possibly different epistemological values would also probably require different guidelines. Journal reviewing might have different guidelines to the reviewing required by conferences presentations or proceedings publications. Scientific research papers

would probably have different guidelines than those recommended for papers of case studies, work in progress, experience-based reflections, industrial innovations, analogical thinking, etc.

One way of dealing with the inherent diversity of disciplines and kinds of papers in a multi-disciplinary context is to ask the reviewers (beside their constructive feedback oriented to improve the paper, their reasoned recommendation for accepting/rejecting the paper) to rate the paper according different criteria established by the respective editor or the respective conference's chair or organizers. The weights of these criteria would depend on the kind of article submitted and on the nature and the objectives of the corresponding Journal or the conference.

Consequently, in multi-, inter-, and trans-disciplinary contexts, especially in those oriented to forums integrated by the academic, industrial and public sectors, we recommend the reviewers to rate the article being reviewed according the following criteria:

1. **Originality:** Not known or experienced before. A technique or a method not used before. Has this or similar work been previously reported? Are the problems and/or approaches in the paper completely new?
2. **Novelty:** According this criterion, it is not necessary for the paper to develop new techniques, or to generate new knowledge, but it should, at least, apply, or combine, them in a fresh and novel way or shed some new light on their applicability in a certain domain.
3. **Innovation:** A new product, process or service based on new or known technologies, methods or methodologies. Known technologies and techniques might be combined to generate new product or service with potential users in the market. What defines an innovation is a new kind of possible users of a product or a service, not necessarily new knowledge, new techniques, new technologies, new methods, or new applications. Innovation is related to new uses or new markets.
4. **Relevance:** Importance, usefulness, and/or applicability of the ideas, methods and/or techniques described in the paper.
5. **Appropriateness:** Suitability, agreeableness, compatibility, congruity, and adequacy of the paper to the areas and topics of the journal or the conference. Would the article perhaps better be presented at another conference?
6. **Significance:** Importance and noteworthiness of the ideas, methods and techniques used and/or described in the article. The problem approached in the article should be interesting and natural,

and not just be chosen by the authors because it can be attacked by their methods. What it is presented in the article is not just obvious and trivial ideas.

7. **Quality:** Scientific, technical, and/or methodological soundness of the article. Correctness of results, proofs and/or reflections. Inclusion in the articles of details that allow checking the correctness of the results or citations of articles where can be found the proof or parts of it.
8. **Presentation:** Adequate organization of the article and the language used in it, as to make its content clear, easily readable and understandable. Clarity in what has been achieved by the author of the article. Even technical papers on a narrow topic should be written such that non-experts can comprehend the main contribution of the paper and the methods employed. The paper shouldn't just be a litany of deep but obscure theorems. The information of the paper should be available to the reader with a minimum of effort.

Audiovisual Equipment

The audiovisual equipment provided for most meetings will be a screen, LCD Projector, and a laptop. Any other equipment, if needed, will have to be supplied by the presenter.

Conference Contacts

Phone: +58 (212) 232-7062

Fax: + (407) 656-3516

Conference Secretariat:

iceme-sec@mail.iceme2013.org

More details can be found at the Conference web page: <http://www.iiis2013.org/iceme>. Answers to specific questions can also be requested by e-mail.