Peer Review Expectations

Due Date: Dec 6, 2022 at 11:59pm EST

Instructions: Engaging in reviewing one of your classmates projects is meant to serve as an introduction to how the scientific community operates. Peer review has two major benefits (outside of its primary use case of accepting/rejecting papers for publication.) First, it gives you practice in reading another individual's work, thinking critically about its strengths and weaknesses, and forming structured opinions about it – being able to quickly summarize and identify key points of interest in this manner is a valuable skill in academia and beyond. Second, carefully reading another individual's work gives you ideas for how to improve your own. Perhaps they have used certain writing techniques or ways of presenting their results that you find appealing, or perhaps they may have thought more carefully about the underlying assumptions and methods they used in their work, which may help inform your own thoughts. However, keep in mind that plagiarism of another student's work is still unacceptable. So while you may be inspired by another student's project to perform modifications to your own, make sure you are not directly lifting their idea and claiming it as your own – if in doubt, please contact me to make sure you what you are doing does not constitute plagiarism.

The peer review must be completed independently. I will email you the project you are meant to review. Write your review (using any template you feel comfortable with), and upload it to Gradescope in pdf form in a file called `YYY_review.pdf`, where YYY corresponds to the unix ID of the student whose project you reviewed. Please remember that you cannot use late days for these submissions, and late submissions will be assigned a score of 0%.

The assignment is graded on a pass/fail basis. You will receive full points if your review meets the standards set out in the requirements below, and 0 otherwise.

Requirements

Your review must be 1-2 pages and cover the following aspects of the project you have been asked to review.

1. **Summary and contributions**: Briefly summarize the project, its goals, and key results.
2. **Strengths**: What are the strengths of the work? Typical criteria include appropriateness of modeling choices, empirical evaluation, creativity, and novelty.
3. **Weaknesses**: What are the weaknesses of the work, and offer some suggestions for improvement.
4. **Clarity**: Is the project well written?
5. **Reproducibility**: Is there sufficient detail to reproduce the major results in the project? What else is needed if not?