Writing Reviews for Scientific Articles

Mock PC Meeting May 21, 2014, in the lab
Draft for peer due May 23, 2014, 6:00 AM
Peer review May 23–27, 2014
Final submission due May 29, 2014 6:00 AM

Use the same group as A02

Please note the unusual submission schedule.

Description
In this assignment, you will practice writing a review to assess contribution of scientific papers to be published in an upcoming conference. You will inspect the paper and prepare arguments to support the acceptance or rejection of the paper. You will present the paper and the argument in the Mock PC Meeting in the lab and write up your review.

Prerequisite
Read CHI Reviewing: A Guide and Examples. This article contain short examples of CHI reviews. For this assignment, you should write a longer review providing more concrete details of criticism and suggestions.

Task
Make a copy of submission template in Google Doc: http://goo.gl/lMgeB1

Part 1: Paper classification: Skim the *assigned paper* (see Appendix 1) to identify (1) contribution types (see Wobbrock, 2014), (2) research approaches (from the lecture), and (3) at least five criteria (drawing from both sources) that you will use to evaluate the paper.

Part 2: Related work: Create a graph showing literature linage (see Assignment 1, Part 2). You may use the papers that are published in later years in your review.
- Your graph must contain at least N + 3 papers where N is the number of members in your team.
- At least three papers must be outside Reference section of the assigned paper.
- Ensure that the selected related work are: (1) relevant to the main contribution of the assigned papers, and (2) from one of the sources mentioned in Appendix 2.
- Ensure that the description of each paper clearly indicate how that paper is related to the assigned paper.

Part 3: Arguments: List the arguments that you want to make in the review in a hierarchical numbered list. Each argument consist of one statement that you want to claim and several evidences. *Substantiate* each proposition in your argument with references in parentheses. For each criticism, add a suggestion for improvements. *Mark* each statement with "(P)raise", "(C)riticism", "(E)vidence", or "(S)uggestion".

- You must have at least five arguments for your review.
- You must include arguments concerning internal and external validity.

Example:

1. C: Internal validity of the statement "effect of text input method to typing speed and the language level in text composition task" (from p. 3 Evaluation)
   1.1. C: Differences in typing speed is influenced by many actions: pondering the text to write [1], familiarity with the keyboard layout, whether the user is a touch-typist or not.
      1.1.1. E: The authors did not control any of these factors. (p. 3 Nothing mentioned in Procedure or Participants section)
   1.2. C: Differences in language level is influenced by educational background of the users.
      1.2.1.E: Users' educational background has found to influence generated text [2].
      1.2.2.S: Analyze the correlation between participants' educational background and generated text.

Mock PC Meeting: In the lab (see date above), each group will discuss the paper and present their arguments for/against the paper. Prepare your notes to discuss in the meeting. Each paper will be discussed with the following agenda:

1. We will show the video of the paper to every participants.
2. Participants from other groups are allowed to question about the details of the paper. Groups with assigned paper must be able to explain them.
3. Each group will present an argument about the paper
4. There will be a discussion and more clarification
5. We will decide whether the paper will be accepted or rejected and list the reasons.

Mock PC Meeting participation is mandatory. It accounts for 2% of the overall score.

Part 4: The Review: Compose your final review in one A4 page (excluding the references) comprising of three parts:

1. *Contribution summary:* Summarize the contribution of the paper in 3–4 sentences.

2. *The review*

    2.1. Write a paragraph summarizing your decision and major concerns of the paper.

    2.2. Compose paragraphs of text based on your arguments listed in Part 2. Here you may merge several points together. You may use severity points format like the example given in the lab, or compose the review in paragraphs like the example in the CHI Reviewing article mentioned above.

    > Example of the review (collaborated from the arguments in the previous part):
    >
    > (---) Doubtful internal validity: First, the speed is confounded by the time users may take to ponder what text to enter [1]. Second, the difference between the language level may be caused by the language level of the specific participants in this study [2]. Therefore, it is not necessary that the language level difference will maintain in other user groups. The authors should analyze the correlation between the language level of the participants and those of the produced text. This may allow a justification that the task allow users to use their own language level, but not the higher language level.

3. *Overall rating:* Choose one from the scale (definite reject) 1–5 (definite accept).

You may incorporate the information from the PC meeting in the review, but your decision in the review is independent from the PC meeting.

Submission
Draft for peer review: Prepare one Google Document containing <u>only Part 3 and References</u> of your submission and set the permission to allow anyone who has the link to comment. <u>Do not include the name of members in this document.</u> Send the link to chat@cs.rwth-aachen.de with the subject "A03 Draft Group XX". See the due date above.

Peer review: You will receive links to the submissions. Give feedback to them by adding comments in the document. In the final submission, your peer will be able to rate the feedback quality. This will influence the pairing for peer feedback in the next assignment. If you give high quality feedback in this assignment, we will pair you with the team that give high quality feedback for the next round of peer feedback. See Grading section below for criteria to give feedback.

Grading: Use the following criteria to evaluate the review from your peer. Rate each aspect from 1 (worst) to 5 (best) and give suggestions in the comment.

Contribution summary
• Were the main contributions of the assigned paper understood correctly?
• Were the description unambiguous? Point out any ambiguities and suggest corrections.

The review: Comment on the following aspects for each of the arguments.
• Is the position of the argument clearly stated (praise vs. criticism)?
• Are the propositions based on identifiable and reputable sources?
• Is the wording of the argument unambiguous?
• For criticism, are there any suggestions for improvements? Are they described in adequate detail that the authors can revise the paper?

Overall rating
• Was the overall rating consistent with the rest of the review?

On peer review feedback: Describing your opinion to the feedback received will help your peer improve their feedback. This is similar to the review that you are writing in this assignment. It also show a gratitude to the hard work your peer contributed to improve your submission. According to my experience, groups that write a detailed feedback to the peer usually perform better in the assignments.

Final submission: Send one PDF file according to the given template to chat@cs.rwth-aachen.de with the subject "A03 Final Submission".

Appendix 1: *Assigned paper* **for reviews**

Authors, Conference	Title	Group
Sodhi et al., CHI '12	LightGuide: Projected Visualizations for Hand Movement Guidance	D2, T1
Hilliges et al., CHI '12	HoloDesk: Direct 3D Interactions with a Situated See-Through Display	T2, M3
Benko et al., CHI'12	MirageTable: Freehand Interaction on a Projected Augmented Reality Tabletop	D1, M1, M2

Appendix 2: Sources
- Conferences:
  - ACM: CHI, UIST, ITS, SUI, MobileHCI, CSCW, Ubicomp, DIS, IUI, SIGGRAPH, SIGGRAPH ASIA,
  - IEEE: 3DUI, VR
- Journals: ACM TOCHI, Int. Jnl. Human–Computer Studies,