**COMP1835**

**Lab 2. Working on your peer review of the research paper.**

**The coursework for COMP1835 consists of two Parts.**

**Part 1. Peer Review of the Research paper**

**Part 2. Implementation**

In this lab you will start working on your Peer Review report.

All our MSc courses are accredited by British Computing Society (BCS), the Chartered Institute for IT. This means that al courses and modules must adhere to the requirements of the BCS.

One of those requirements is the knowledge and practical skills of a peer review : the graduates must be able to demonstrate that they can participate effectively in the peer review process.

You will be provided with a short research paper written by other students. It will be anonymised for a blind peer review.

You are required to produce a peer review report and submit it as Part 1 of your coursework.

A peer review report is a report (up to four pages in length) that addresses the following important aspects of the reviewed paper:

1. Summary
2. Major issues
3. Minor issues
4. Presentation and style comments
5. References comments

You are required to produce **in your own words** a well-structured review of the paper (about 2000 words). **Do not cut and paste sections from the Internet, as this will receive zero marks.**

**Here is some useful information on how to write a peer review report:**

**How to Structure Your Peer Review Report** (adopted from Wiley ‘Step by step guide to reviewing a manuscript’ <https://authorservices.wiley.com/home.html>). Try to answer all the questions. If you are following an informal report format you could structure your report in three sections: summary, major issues, minor issues.

**Summary**

* Give positive feedback first. Authors are more likely to read your review if you do so. But don't overdo it if you will be recommending rejection
* Briefly summarize what the paper is about and what the findings are
* Try to put the findings of the paper into the context of the existing literature and current knowledge
* Indicate the significance of the work and if it is novel or mainly confirmatory
* Indicate the work's strengths, its quality and completeness
* State any major flaws or weaknesses and note any special considerations. For example, if previously held theories are being overlooked

**Major Issues**

* Are there any major flaws? State what they are and what the severity of their impact is on the paper
* Has similar work already been published without the authors acknowledging this?
* Are the authors presenting findings that challenge current thinking? Is the evidence they present strong enough to prove their case? Have they cited all the relevant work that would contradict their thinking and addressed it appropriately?
* If major revisions are required, try to indicate clearly what they are
* Are there any major presentational problems? Are figures & tables, language and manuscript structure all clear enough for you to accurately assess the work?
* Are there any ethical issues? If you are unsure it may be better to disclose these in the confidential comments section

**Minor Issues**

* Are there places where meaning is ambiguous? How can this be corrected?
* Are the correct references cited? If not, which should be cited instead/also? Are citations excessive, limited, or biased?
* Are there any factual, numerical or unit errors? If so, what are they?
* Are all tables and figures appropriate, sufficient, and correctly labelled? If not, say which are not

**On Presentation and Style**

Your review should ultimately help the author improve their article. So be polite, honest and clear. You should also try to be objective and constructive, not subjective and destructive.

You should also:

* Write clearly and so you can be understood by people whose first language is not English
* Avoid complex or unusual words, especially ones that would even confuse native speakers
* Number your points and refer to page and line numbers in the manuscript when making specific comments
* If you have been asked to only comment on specific parts or aspects of the manuscript, you should indicate clearly which these are
* Treat the author's work the way you would like your own to be treated

**On References**

* Check if the references are current and present the wide range of sources (books, journal articles, internet sources)
* Check if the references are done correctly, following the Harvard Referencing system
* If the citations in the text are done correctly