

Phase 2 - Papers Review

1 \* Insert the Group ID

Não usar separador de milhares.

2 \* Insert the ID number of the first paper.

Não usar separador de milhares.

3 \* Does the paper follow the LNCS template?

☐ Sim ☐ Não

4 \* Insert the ID number of the second paper.

Não usar separador de milhares.

5 \* Does the paper follow the LNCS template?

☐ Sim ☐ Não

6 \* **Overall evaluation.**

Rate your overall perception of the quality of the paper where 1 is Very Low, and 5 is Very Good.

	1	2	3	4	5
Paper 1	<input checked="" type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Paper 2	<input checked="" type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

7 \* **Grade the paper structure from 1 (very bad) to 5 (very good).**

The paper should have: title, abstract, introduction, literature review, analysis, implications and recommendations, conclusion and a bibliography.

	1	2	3	4	5
paper 1	<input checked="" type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
paper 2	<input checked="" type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

8 \* **Grade the depth of analysis from 1 (Very Low) to 5 (Very High).**

To assess the depth of analysis, it might be helpful to consider the extent to which the author explores different angles and perspectives on the topic.

The paper should demonstrate a nuanced understanding of the issue's complexities and offer evidence-based arguments that are well-supported and well-reasoned.

	1	2	3	4	5
paper 1	<input checked="" type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
paper 2	<input checked="" type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

9 \* **Grade the clarity and coherence of writing from 1 (Very Low) to 5 (Very High).**

This criterion could be further refined by considering factors such as grammar, syntax, and vocabulary use. The paper should be free of errors that impede understanding, and the writing should flow smoothly from one idea to the next.

	1	2	3	4	5
paper 1	<input checked="" type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
paper 2	<input checked="" type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

\* **Rate the originality and creativity of this paper from 1 (very low) to 5 (very high).**

10 In terms of originality and creativity, evaluating the extent to which the author offers a unique perspective or approach that is not already well-represented in existing literature could be helpful.

The paper should demonstrate creativity and innovation in its analysis, perhaps by proposing new ideas or solutions to the issue.

	1	2	3	4	5
paper 1	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
paper 2	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

11 \* **Rate the relevance and significance of this paper from 1 (very low) to 5 (very high).**

To assess relevance and significance, it could be helpful to consider the content of the text regarding the current state of the topic.

The paper should make a strong case for why the topic is important and how it fits into the larger conversation on the social and professional impact of technology.

	1	2	3	4	5
paper 1	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
paper 2	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

12 \* **Rate the quality of using sources from 1 (very low) to 5 (very high).**

To evaluate the use of sources, it could be helpful to assess the quality, relevance, and credibility of the sources cited.

The paper should draw on diverse sources, including peer-reviewed articles, books, and other scholarly works, as well as relevant news articles and reports.

	1	2	3	4	5
paper 1	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
paper 2	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

13 \* **Rate the engagement quality with opposing views from 1 (very low) to 5 (very high).**

To evaluate engagement with opposing views, it could be helpful to consider the extent to which the author acknowledges and responds to counterarguments. b. The paper should demonstrate an understanding of alternative perspectives and a willingness to engage with them respectfully and thoughtfully.

	1	2	3	4	5
paper 1	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
paper 2	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

14 \* **Rate the quality of Ethical considerations from 1 (very low or inexistent) to 5 (very high).**

To assess ethical considerations, it could be helpful to consider the implications of the author's arguments for different stakeholders, such as users, industry professionals, and society at large.

The paper should address any ethical concerns related to the topic and provide a nuanced analysis of their implications.

	1	2	3	4	5
paper 1	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
paper 2	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

15 \* **Rate the Overall impact from 1 (very low) to 5 (very high).**

It could be helpful to consider its potential to influence the conversation on the social and professional impact of technology.

The paper should make a compelling and original argument that contributes to the field and offers insights or solutions that are relevant and meaningful.

	1	2	3	4	5
paper 1	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
paper 2	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

This text should have the following structure:

1 - **Overview:** This text has 4 or 5 paragraphs describing in your own terms: what the paper is about, your major impression of the quality of the paper and corresponding justification (not less than 20 lines, not more than 40 lines). Besides this summary, you also list the positive and the negative aspects of the paper (e.g. is the topic well motivated or too dispersed, the ethical discussion is well achieved, does it make good use of the number of pages limit -16 - for the text or it only approached the topic in a shallow manner, does it achieve the goals of this course or it is totally off track, ...).

You can use this check list (and the previous questions in this questionnaire) to inspire for your discussion:

- Coherence regarding the nature and objectives of the curricular unit (relevance).
- Capacity for theoretical-analytical deepening, confronting perspectives of different actors, authors and argumentative lines (foundation)
- Articulation and coherence between the various parts of the text (consistency)
- Formal quality of the discourse (write clearly, without spelling errors, with rigour and objectivity), of the organization of the document, and the bibliographic referencing (consistently adopts procedures accepted by the academic community)

2 - **Major and Minor remarks:** section by section, you should pinpoint what is wrong, for instance, in terms of coherence, if things are well justified or not and if they are poorly explained (including problems in the grammar or syntax).

3 - **Improvements suggestions:** What could be done to improve the paper/discussion.

You finalize this part with a section (2 or 3 paragraphs) **arguing for a perspective and the position you hold.**

↵

✎

A ▾

B

I

☰

☷

🔗

🔄

17

\*

Review text of paper 2.

This text should have the following structure:

1 - **Overview:** This text has 4 or 5 paragraphs describing in your own terms: what the paper is about, your major impression of the quality of the paper and corresponding justification (not less than 20 lines, not more than 40 lines). Besides this summary, you also list the positive and the negative aspects of the paper (e.g. is the topic well motivated or too dispersed, the ethical discussion is well achieved, does it make good use of the number of pages limit -16 - for the text or it only approached the topic in a shallow manner, does it achieve the goals of this course or it is totally off track, ...).

You can use this check list (and the previous questions in this questionnaire) to inspire for your discussion:

- Coherence regarding the nature and objectives of the curricular unit (relevance).
- Capacity for theoretical-analytical deepening, confronting perspectives of different actors, authors and argumentative lines (foundation)
- Articulation and coherence between the various parts of the text (consistency)
- Formal quality of the discourse (write clearly, without spelling errors, with rigour and objectivity), of the organization of the document, and the bibliographic referencing (consistently adopts procedures accepted by the academic community)

2 - **Major and Minor remarks:** section by section, you should pinpoint what is wrong, for instance, in terms of coherence, if things are well justified or not and if they are poorly explained (including problems in the grammar or syntax).

3 - **Improvements suggestions:** What could be done to improve the paper/discussion.

You finalize this part with a section (2 or 3 paragraphs) **arguing for a perspective and the position you hold.**

↵

A

▼

B

I

☰

☷

🔗

🔄

p|

18

\*

Grade your perception for the amount of effort and depth of work done for producing this paper — rate from 1 (very low) to 5 (very high).

paper 1  
paper 2

	1	2	3	4	5
<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Fechar esta janela