CTHCl 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: 1: 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: 1: 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

From Writing for Computer Science (Zobel, 2004)
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

From Writing for Computer Science (Zobel, 2004)
In-Class Practice

Writing a review of an evaluation section

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