

Linguistically inclusive guidelines for reviewers of ICCB 2025 session proposals and talk/poster abstracts

Purpose

Part of the philosophy of the ICCB 2025 is to "provide a safe and inclusive space that is accessible for people of diverse cultures and backgrounds to share their insights, knowledge, and research with the shared aim of addressing conservation challenges and advancing conservation science and practice" ([ICCB 2025 Philosophy Statement](#)). To achieve this goal and support non-native English speakers, the Language Accessibility Sub-committee developed linguistically-inclusive guidelines for reviewers to follow when reviewing proposal of symposia, forums, workshops and training courses, and talk/poster abstracts.

Guidelines

Some proficiency of English is necessary to effectively communicate study findings in an abstract. However, reviewers of ICCB 2025 proposals should recognise the difficulty that authors may have in writing in a language that is not their first or most proficient language ([COPE: Ethical Guidelines for Peer Reviewers](#)).

For reviewers of session proposals

We stress that **reviewers should focus on the merit, significance and impact of the proposal, rather than on language proficiency. Please note that no proposal should be rejected for poor language.**

When assessing a proposal, please focus on whether:

- The relationship of ideas can be followed;
- There is a sense of underlying coherence to the proposed ideas;
- There is merit and significance in the proposed ideas.

If you decide to provide feedback on a proposal, please provide specific feedback in a more civil, constructive, and less disparaging way, rather than demanding blanket editing by 'native English speakers', and refrain from rewriting the proposal in your preferred style if it is basically sound and clear.

For reviewers of talk/poster abstracts

The ICCB2025 Scientific Sub-committee has decided to accept all submitted abstracts on a first-come, first-served basis until the capacity limit is reached. **Please note that at ICCB2025 we will not reject any abstract for poor language.** When assessing each abstract, focus on whether:

- The relationship of ideas can be followed, and
- There is a sense of underlying coherence to the proposed ideas.

Abstracts should be sent back to authors for revision only if:

- They fail to communicate key messages, or
- Important messages are likely to be obscured for a reader unfamiliar with the topic.

If you decide to provide feedback on an abstract, please provide specific feedback in a more civil, constructive, and less disparaging way, rather than demanding blanket editing by 'native English speakers', and refrain from rewriting the abstract in your preferred style if it is basically sound and clear.