Review Form for Multimedia Communications Seminar SS 2018
==
(Please replace all the []'s with your ratings/text. To be filled in English)

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: 4

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 organization 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?
Does the paper contain a reference section?
1 = this does not follow the formatting guidelines at all
2 = some parts 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: [1]

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 your 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: [4]

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

Overall, the contribution is already very advanced. It introduces the topic area and summarizes an existing approach precisely. I still see potential for improvement at the end of the article:

- The discussion in chapter 4.4. lists some aspects. However, some of these seem incoherent in the form of an enumeration. Also missing is an introductory sentence.
- The same applies to chapter 5, which does not seem to be fully formulated yet. It remains unclear why it is called "Extensions". Isn't it more of an assessment or an outlook?
- At the end of the introduction, no reference is made to chapter 5.

Unfortunately the post uses the wrong template. The IEEE template (see website or slides) and not the TU template must be used.

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

[]