Review Form for Multimedia Communications Seminar SS 2018
==

Paper Title

Making Matches – Recommending the right personality

Previous work

Please judge the extent to which this paper recognizes and summarizes previous work in this area.
This should include a number of references.
1 = no previous work mentioned
2 = very little amount of pointers to previous work, or very unclear relevance
3 = some pointers to previous work, but important references are missing
4 = mostly complete overview of previous work
5 = very good summary of previous work, given the space constraints

Your Score: 5

Style and Organization

Please judge the writing style of this paper. Is the writing style scientific? Is the language used
correctly? Is the outline and overall organisation suitable?
1 = this is not a scientific paper
2 = there are a lot of style problems, organization is unclear
3 = there are some style problems, but it is ok overall
4 = only minor style or organizational problems
5 = great style, language, and overall organization

Your Score: 4

Formatting

Please judge how well the formatting guidelines were followed. Does the paper contain an
unnumbered abstract? Are authors and their affiliation given properly? Was the ACL style file used?
Doe the paper contain a reference section?
1 = this does not follow the formatting guidelines at all
2 = some part of guidelines are followed, but overall the formatting is very remote from the
guidelines
3 = formatting is ok, but needs improvements
4 = only minor details do not follow the formatting guidelines
5 = ready to print! formatting guidelines were followed entirely.

Your Score: 2

State of Completion

Please judge how far this work is from completion. This includes marking missing experiments,
missing sections in the paper, and missing information.

1 = extremely preliminary - no experiments were conducted
2 = very preliminary: some things were done, but still a lot is missing towards a final version
3 = paper is still incomplete, but it is clear where the author is heading
4 = only a few experiments / sections are missing, paper is close to complete
5 = this paper comprises a complete work

Your Score: 4

Overall Rating

Please give an overall rating for this paper. If a lot of papers compete for a limited amount of slots, this would be the main score for deciding on paper acceptance.
1 = this paper is not worth presenting
2 = I would rather not see this paper in the workshop
3 = the paper is ok for the workshop, if enough slots are available
4 = I would rather like to see the paper in the workshop
5 = the paper will be great for the workshop

Your Score: 4

Reviewer Confidence

Please state how confident are in you decisions
1 = I have no idea about the topic of this paper, so please don't trust my judgments
2 = I have very little idea about the topic, so my judgments should be taken with a grain of salt
3 = I have some idea about the topic, but I am not an expert and I could have missed some things
4 = I am pretty confident that my judgments are correct, since I know the topic well
5 = I am an expert and thus very confident that my judgments are correct

Your Score: 3

Comments to the authors (please refer to https://cs.brown.edu/~sk/Memos/Paper-Reviews/)

Layout:
- A wrong template was used for the report – according to the organizational slides, the IEEE report template should have been used
  - When using the IEEE template, chapters are not included, they will have to be translated to sections
- Try to arrange the figures better – pages that only consist of figures should be avoided, as they interrupt the flow of reading.
  - The figures themselves are a little blurry, but still can be read rather easily
- Chapters should not start with sections/subsections immediately, rather give a short introduction to the topics of the chapter. Section 4.1 does not have to be a section/subsection, just start the text immediately after the title

Structure:

- The abstract is missing…
- There is no real conclusion-section. You could consolidate Section 4.4 and Chapter 5 into a section like "Conclusion and future work" or "Discussion and future work", as both sections contain related arguments. If the two sections are not consolidated, 4.4 should be separated from Chapter 4.
- Chapter 5 is still incomplete, stops in mid sentence.
- The overview of the paper in the introduction is incomplete, chapter 5 is not mentioned at all. The explanation of the topics of chapter 3's sections should not be in the introduction, rather start chapter 3 with this.
- The remaining structure is fine and easy to follow.

Content/Scientific approach:

All fine here, there are some good arguments and valid criticism in the discussion.

References/Plagiarism:

As already stated, references are missing. Citations are somewhat included and everything seems to be cited correctly.

Language:

- There are some typos/spelling mistakes (like at the end of section 3.2 "often times" instead of oftentimes) or wrong word usage (like reference section XY instead of refer to section XY), but it doesn't really impact the readability of the report.
  - Instead of using "Please reference sections 4.2 and 4.4 for a deeper look into user modeling…" you could write something like "In Sections 4.2 and 4.4, the usage of user modeling is presented and discussed on the basis of a specific example."
- Transitional phrases like in the end of chapter 3 or section 4.2 should not be necessary and sometimes deviate from the topic of a given section – just leave those out.

Confidential comments to the committee (this part will only be shown to supervisors, not the author)

The references are missing, therefore I could not check for reliability or the selection of the sources