Analysis report of "Design of Millimeter Wave Microstrip Reflectarrays"

Pavlo Tokariev
Inria, I3S, Université Côte d'Azur, Sophia Antipolis

April 5, 2022

1. First reading: introduction and conclusion (what is it about?)
2. Second reading: the authors are brilliant! (detect good ideas)
   (a) the authors had a strong motivation to perform this research: which one?
   (b) they established something successful in that direction that
   (c) constitutes the main contribution of the article: what exactly?
   (d) what makes them/you enthusiastic about this result?
3. Third reading: the article has weaknesses! (scientific doubt)
   (a) real scope of the experimental results?
   (b) justified affirmations?
   (c) exaggerated extrapolations?
   (d) mostly obvious results?
4. Quality:
   (a) of course there is this "summary aspect" with the key points of the article, their links with the cited references, what novelty is offered by the article
   (b) but you should also check additional information, what is known elsewhere about the subject, from what sources you got it, and what is the reliability of these sources
   (c) lastly, you should have a critical view, to evaluate the real scope of the article, some assertions of the article may possibly be a little too "optimistic." Are they some extrapolations of external results, possibly a little abusive? is the structure of the article properly made with respect to the its goal? do the experimental results actually support the assertions? etc.

5. Scientific contribution:
    (a) What is the scientific domain and context of the contribution
    (b) In what respect is it original w.r.t. other contemporary or past publications?
    (c) avoid recursive readings from article references to article references: it rapidly goes deep in the past.
    (d) rather use keywords and your ability to explore bibliography
    (e) Have hindsight and do not neglect to put the article into context
6. Writing:
    (a) Is the introduction informative and motivating?
    (b) Are experimental material and methods properly described?
    (c) In the discussion, are the main affirmations actually deducible from their experiments and the current knowledge?
    (d) Are the results actually innovative?
        i. w.r.t. the year of the article,
        ii. in particular w.r.t. the previous publications of the authors.
7. Generally:
    (a) within 2 to 4 pages, you cannot go into all the technical details
    (b) rather have hindsight in order to understand the role of each technical aspect within the whole contribution
    (c) one (or a few) technical aspect(s) may be a major articulation of the contribution; in which case you should point it out and explain why this aspect is of major importance
    (d) being concise is also part of the exercise

General ideas or thoughts:

1.

References