CSCM69 – Human-Centred Perspectives and Methods
Coursework 2 individual report review form, 2020

Guidelines

This form is designed in the style of a conference submission review. The purpose of this exercise is to help you practice and get used to these sorts of reviews from both the reviewer and author side.

The questions and guidance below are intentionally presented using the format and language typically used for conference or journal peer review tasks. As a result of this, the sections you need to complete are not all worded in a way that is directly related to the coursework. Please do fill out the entire form, however, using your judgement to interpret the questions as appropriate. For example, use "Overall recommendation" as a substitute for your rating of the overall quality of the work.

I will be marking all reports individually, and will decide the final marks. I will give my own comments, as in Coursework 1, but will also provide a copy of the review submitted for each one.

Reviewing is double-blind: neither you nor the person whose report you are reviewing know each other's identity. Please avoid entering any details that would identify you to the submission author. Anonymous peer review is used to allow reviewers to be honest with their opinions and critique about the work. The aim is to remove any pressure that might arise from prior knowledge or relationships with the authors. However, please try to also include constructive feedback. A review which provides only harsh criticisms without offering any pointers for improvement is not very helpful.

You should submit your review via the form that is available on Canvas. The deadline for this task is 4th December 2020 (11:59pm). This task is worth 5% of the CSCM69 module mark.

Submission title

Please enter the title of the submission you are reviewing

Expertise

Please provide your expertise in the topic area of this paper

☐ Expert   ☐ Knowledgeable   ☐ Passing knowledge   ☐ No knowledge

Overall recommendation

Please provide your overall recommendation for the paper

☐ 5.0: Strong accept – I would argue strongly for accepting this paper

☐ 4.5: Between possibly accept and strong accept

☐ 4.0: Possibly accept – I would argue for accepting this paper

☐ 3.5: Between neutral and possibly accept

☐ 3.0: Neutral – I am unable to argue for accepting or rejecting this paper

☐ 2.5: Between possibly reject and neutral

☐ 2.0: Possibly reject – The submission is weak and probably shouldn't be accepted, but there is some chance it should get in

☐ 1.5: Between reject and possibly reject

☐ 1.0: Reject: I would argue for rejecting this paper

The review

Write your review of the paper here, justifying the overall recommendation you gave above. Highlight the strengths and utility of the work, and be constructive when discussing the weaknesses and limitations with clear suggestions and relevant citations. Please consider:
- Positive aspects: What did you like best about this paper? What new things did you learn from reading this paper? What insights did you find most interesting?
- Relevant previous work: Is prior work adequately reviewed?
- Validity of the work presented: How confidently can researchers and practitioners use the results reported in this paper? If you have concerns about the approaches taken by the author(s), please cite a source for your objection (e.g., a definitive paper, a set of professional guidelines or a standard textbook). This is needed to help author(s) improve their submissions.
- Negative aspects: What, if any, major concerns did you have about this work?
- Suggestions for revisions: How could the author(s) improve this paper?
- Presentation clarity
- Any other recommendations that you think might be of use to the author(s)