

Paper Title [1]

Federal University of Alagoas – Computing Institute
Lecture: Distributed Systems – Lecturer: André Lage Freitas

Paper reviewed by: **TODO Reviewer Name** (TODO n. matrícula) in TODO yyyy-mm-dd

I. INTRODUCTION

[illegible]

II. CONTRIBUTION

In this section you should summarize the main contributions of the paper. Explain the proposed approach(es) by highlighting its importance to the state-of-the-art in the research field. Until here, your manuscript should be a summary, so focus on explaining what the authors claim to be a contribution. The size of this section may vary between one and two paragraphs, it will depend on the contribution(s) and how long you planned to do the next section. However, you should not write here more than twenty lines.

[illegible]

III. DISCUSSION

Finally, you should write your critics about the article. Fill the Table I knowing that this section should contain your arguments that sustain such evaluation¹. In order to clarify your arguments, write a short paragraph for each criterion as following exemplified.

Presentation The paper is well written with adequate technical language. ...

Originality The proposed approach is not quite original. Several work have addressed the same issue with similar results. ...

Relevance The contribution is relevant to the state-of-the-art as scalability in distributed system is a crucial aspects. ...

Overall evaluation The overall evaluation is *Good* which would be similar to accept the paper to be published in a international conference. ...

In other words, suppose that you are reviewing a paper for a conference. In the \TeX file you find more detail about each criterion in the table. Moreover, you are welcome to improve your discussion by writing beyond the scope of the evaluation but remember to be coherent with respect to the research domain addressed by the article.

| Criterion | Poor | Fair | Average | Good | Exceptional |
|--------------------|------|------|---------|------|-------------|
| Presentation | | | x | | |
| Originality | | | x | | |
| Relevance | | | x | | |
| Overall evaluation | | | x | | |

TABLE I
EVALUATION OF ARTICLE [1].

Further general rules are:

- the review should fit in one full page;
- you can use three references maximum;
- do not change the template style (font size and type, spacing, margins, etc.).

[illegible]

REFERENCES

- [1] E. W. Dijkstra. On the role of scientific thought. In *Selected Writings on Computing: A Personal Perspective*, pages 60–66. Springer-Verlag, 1982.

¹Mark a single “x” for each criterion.