CTHCI Lab 2
Writing a Review (Part 1)

Plan

- Review
- Practice: Paper structure
- Practice: Writing a review for an evaluation section
- Logistics of Assignment Zero
- Reflection
- (optional) Demo: Searching and retrieving literature

Yesterday in Current Topics…

- Differences between descriptive empirical research and ethnographic research
- Triangulation
- Key attributes from Engineering & Design research
- Internal vs. external validity
- Learning curve

Measures

\[ \text{WPM} = \frac{|T| - 1}{S} \times 60 \times \frac{1}{5} \]
\[ \text{KSPS} = \frac{|IS| - 1}{S} \]
\[ \text{KSPC} = \frac{|IS|}{|T|} \]

\((19 - 1)/10 \times 60/5 = 21.6\)
\((31 - 1)/10 = 3\)
\(31/19 = 1.63\)
Assignment Zero:
Writing a Review for Dummies

- Write a review about the evaluation section for one of these papers:
  - Typing on Flat Glass¹ (Findlater et al., CHI ’11)
  - The 1Line Keyboard² (Li et al., UIST ’11)

- Required reading for background:
  - Evaluation of Text Entry Techniques³ (MacKenzie, 2007)

- Peer grading
  - In groups of 3, select one of the papers
  - Individually review the evaluation sections in the paper
  - Grade each other’s review
  - Structured review form and grading form will be posted online
  - Submission: 3 × original reviews and 6 × peer grading feedback
  - Deadline: Tuesday, April 23rd, 2013 before 12:00 noon

---

In-Class Practice
Paper structure and writing a review of an evaluation section

- **Review**: Plain text in one page A4 (font size: Helvetica or Arial 12pt)
  - Summary: Summarize the main contributions and benefits of the paper in one short paragraph (max. 5 sentences)
  - Evaluation: You may structure this section freely
  - Suggestion for improvements
  - Final judgement: Would you accept, reject this paper? Why?

- **Peer feedback**: one page A4

- **Recommended schedule**
  - Saturday: finish your review
  - Monday evening: finish your feedback
  - Tuesday morning: collect all 6 pages in PDF (include your names and Mat. Nr.) and email to Chat

---

Logistics of Assignment Zero

- **Review**: Plain text in one page A4 (font size: Helvetica or Arial 12pt)
  - Summary: Summarize the main contributions and benefits of the paper in one short paragraph (max. 5 sentences)
  - Evaluation: You may structure this section freely
  - Suggestion for improvements
  - Final judgement: Would you accept, reject this paper? Why?

- **Peer feedback**: one page A4

- **Recommended schedule**
  - Saturday: finish your review
  - Monday evening: finish your feedback
  - Tuesday morning: collect all 6 pages in PDF (include your names and Mat. Nr.) and email to Chat

---

Peer Feedback Guide

- **First glance**: How organized is the structure of the review?

- **Paper understanding**
  - How well did the reviewer understand the contribution of the paper?
  - How well did the reviewer understand the methods used in the paper?
  - What points might the reviewer misunderstand?

- **The review**
  - How clear and how concise was the reviewer’s arguments?
  - How substantiate was the arguments?
  - How detailed were the suggestions?
  - How constructive was the tone of the review?

- **Additional suggestions to improve the review**
Reflection

• Lecture 2: Example of experimental text entry research

• Short-term purpose (this course)
  • To appreciate the detail and pitfalls that is needed for understanding an experimental research paper

• Medium-term purpose (your thesis)
  • To recognize some of the important factors that you need to consider when planning a user study

• Long-term purpose (your life)
  • To be an intelligent knowledge consumer by spotting potential flaws from the scientific studies

Demo:
Retrieving and Searching for Papers

• Google Scholar: Entry point, alerts, citation search, finding the full version for free.

• ACM Digital Library: The main archive, video materials, comprehensive search by author.

• Citeology: Citation visualization (1982–2010)
  • http://www.autodeskresearch.com/projects/citeology