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**RESEARCH QUESTION or PROBLEM STATEMENT**

*1. What is the paper about? What “puzzle” is the writer trying to resolve? What is the need they are trying to address or the problem they are trying to solve? Please identify and, in your own words, restate the writer’s research question or topic.*

Guang is trying to develop a rating system for competitors in Codeforce, a coding competition website. The aim is to create a rating and ranking method for competitors and to then be able to help them achieve higher ratings, mentioning important factors based on the backend ranking system coded.

*2. Is the research question or problem statement clear and precise? Does it address a problem that is interesting and relevant?*

Yes – the idea is to create an up-to-date ranking methodology and also to help competitors be able to perform better and achieve higher ratings in this coding competition.

**REVIEW QUESTIONS**

*3. What is the author’s main point or argument? Please restate it in your own words.*

Codeforce’s official ranking system was designed six years ago, and is not as relevant to the current data available about the competitors. Guang aims to adapt a new ranking method using Elo, with the original method as a basis, that may more accurately be able to rate and rank the competitors, as well as provide insight on how the rankings have been assigned and what factors, or actions, can then push competitors to achieve higher ratings.

*4. Does the writer provide a clear and convincing “road map” of the research paper? Is the data used suitable and enough to answer the research question?*

Yes – the structure of the paper will include general components like an introduction and some background information, but, from my judgement, will mostly be methodology and analysis focused. I believe there will be quite a lot of detail on the method itself, given the explanation in the proposal itself, and the aim includes analyzing the results produced to summarize a strategy competitors can use to push higher ratings, which will form the discussion section. The data is all publicly available on the Codeforces website itself, so should be reliable and easy to access.

*5. What do you hope you can learn from this work when it's complete?*

I haven’t participated in any form of coding competitions before, but I think it would be incredibly interesting to see how certain factors – like the number of attempts made, or the time taken – impact a competitor’s rating. It almost has a similar theme to my own research, which looks at ranking the correlation of factors, so I would love to learn about how this idea can apply to other topics, like competitions, in this case.

*6. What clarification do you need as this scholar moves from the draft to the final paper?*

There might need to be a little more clarification on the strategy aspect of it; how will creating this ranking system be able to help devise a better strategy for scoring higher? However, I know this will probably be something to develop later on after the method itself is coded and functional, and can produced results for this analysis.

*7. What ideas come to mind to you about this work and what might be tackled?*

I think it might be a good idea to discuss, in the analysis or further work section, how this idea can be more broadly applied to other areas of study as well, like other competitions, or even why this idea cannot be applied to other sections, and what the reason behind that is; I think this would just help put the research into context and make it more applicable outside of Codeforce itself. For example, there are other coding competition websites like HackerRank, so it might be an interesting idea to briefly mention or discuss whether this algorithm might apply in that regard, and why or why not.

**OVERALL**

*8. Do you have any general comments and suggestions?*

I think Guang has a really strong sense of direction and a very clear idea of the aim of the paper and how to achieve it. I think the only thing might be to develop the writing in terms of the introduction and background, but of course, this will probably be worked on later, after some work on the code is done, during the development of the draft. Other than that, I think it’s a very strong and well-thought paper!