# CTHCI Lab 4 Writing a Review



### Criteria for a Good Paper

- Contribution: What new insight does it bring to the field?
- Benefits: What can one learn from this / do with this?
- Novelty: Prior publications?
- · Validity: Are the claims properly backed up?
- Applicability: How good does the paper match the likely audience?
- Format: Readability and clarity



#### Structure of a Review

- Overall rating: I: definite reject 5: definite accept
- Short summary of the contributions and benefits
  - "This paper presents... (who) will benefit from (what)
- Concerns
  - Originality
  - Validity
  - Clarity
- Suggestions for improvement
- Reviewer's expertise: I: no knowledge 4 expert



## Reviewing Checklist

- Recommending accept
  - Convince yourself that it has no serious defects
  - · Convince the editor that it is of an acceptable standard, by explaining why it is original, valid, and clear
  - List the changes that should be made before it appears in print
    - Where possible: indicating not just what to change but what to change it to
  - Take reasonable care in checking details, e..g, mathematics, formulas, and bibliography
- Recommending reject
  - · Clearly explain the faults and, where possible, discuss how they could be rectified
  - Indicate which parts of the work are of value and which should be discarded
  - · Check the paper to a reasonable level of detail





## Reviewing Checklist

- Always do the following in either case
  - Provide good references with which the authors should be familiar
  - Ask yourself whether your comments are fair, specific, and polite
  - Be honest about your limitations as a referee of that paper
  - Check your review carefully as you would check one of your own paper prior to submission



### In-Class Practice

Writing a review of an evaluation section

- Presentation Strategies for Micro-Navigation in the Physical World
- Grabrics: A Foldable Two-Dimensional Textile Input Controller

