CISC-810: Research Foundation
(Fall Semester, 2020-2021)

Assignment: Reviewing Your Peers' Research Manuscripts
(Due Date: Oct 13, 2020)

In this assignment, you will prepare the *critical reviews* of the three manuscripts that have been assigned to you. Please upload the reviews to mycourses and also email them to your peers who are the authors of these three papers. You should also prepare yourself for the class discussions of the manuscripts and your reviews in the coming weeks.

1. **Submission requirements:**
   a. Upload your reviews as three separate files (one file per manuscript reviewed) in doc or pdf formats into the corresponding box. Each file should contain two reviews (for a conference and for a journal) of the same manuscripts. Name each file as AuthornameYournameConference or AuthornameYournameJournal.
   b. Email your reviews to the authors of the corresponding manuscript.
   c. Please finish up this assignment by the due date (No extension will be granted)

2. **Review for Conferences:**
   a. Nowadays conference reviewing is typically done online. Commonly, you will have to fill in an evaluation form on the conference review website, such as reproduced below, and to write your more detailed comments for the authors and/or the Program Committee. Often there is a tight schedule for you to finish the review, typically several weeks.
      - Most highly prestigious computing conferences follow the *double-blind* submission/review policy.
      - Recently, some of the highly prestigious conferences have provided reviewers' forum to reach certain consensus before releasing the reviews to the authors.
      - It is also quite common for the highly prestigious conferences to have a 7-10 days *rebuttal period*, during which authors can submit responses to the reviews.
      - The acceptance/rejection decisions are collectively made by the conference Program Committee. It is quite rare that a decision can be reversed.

b. In this section you should prepare a review for the manuscript as if it was submitted to a conference.
- Paper ID:
- Title:
- Author(s):
- Reviewer's Recommendations:
    i. **Writing** (choose one)
        o Not readable
        o Major improvement needed
        o Minor improvement suggested
        o Well written
    ii. **Novelty** (choose one)
        o Original
        o Somewhat interesting
        o Borderline
        o Been there, done that
    iii. **Suitability** (choose one)
        o Very related
        o Limited interests
        o Not suited
    iv. **Reviewer's Expertise** (choose one)
        o Expert
        o Knowledgeable
        o Passing interests
        o Not my cup of tea
    v. **Recommendation** (choose one)
        o Absolute reject
        o Reject if there is no space
        o Accept if there is space
        o Absolute accept
- Reviewer's detailed comments: strength, weakness, suggestion
    i. **Comments for the Authors:**
    ii. **Comments for the Program Committee (will be kept confidential and NOT released to the authors)**

3. **Review for Journals:**
    a. Journal reviewing is also typically done online. Commonly, an associate editor will coordinate the reviews of a submitted manuscript among 3-4 reviewers. While reviews for journals often need to be more detailed than those for conferences, you are given longer time to complete the assessment, typically 4-8 weeks.
    - Manuscripts submitted for journal consideration usually have all authors' information on the title page.
    - The associate editor makes the recommendation to the chief editor based on all reviews: accept, minor revision, major revision, reject.

b. In this section you should prepare a review for the manuscript as if it was submitted to a journal. Please note that, for journal reviews, the more feedback you provide, the more assistance you give the authors to improve their papers and the editors to make fair decisions. Feel free to supplement each answer with your comments.

- Paper ID:
- Title:
- Author(s):
- **Goals and Contributions:**
    i. Do the authors clearly state the research goals of the work?
    ii. Does the paper clearly indicate what the contributions are?
    iii. Are the claimed contributions original and significant in terms of
        o Novel methodology?
        o New applications?
    iv. Does the paper describe the methods in sufficient detail for readers to replicate the work?
- **Evaluation:**
    i. Do the authors carefully evaluate the approach?
    ii. Does the paper include systematic experiments, a careful theoretical analysis, or give evidence of generality?
- **Discussion:**
    i. Does the paper discuss relevant earlier works, noting similarities, differences and progress?
    ii. Does it discuss the limitation of the approach as well as its advantages?
    iii. Does it consider the implication of the work and outline direction for future work?
- **Presentation:**
    i. Is the paper properly organized and well written?
    ii. Is the paper grammatically correct and free of spelling errors?
    iii. Does it use standard terminology?
- **Detailed Comments:**
- **Recommendation:**
    i. The paper could be published in its current form.
    ii. The paper could be published after minor revision:
        o Another round of review is needed.
        o No review is needed.
    iii. The paper requires major revision for further consideration.
    iv. The paper is not suitable for publication in this journal.