

# COMP90042 Assignment 3 Part 2: Review Scoring

Copyright the University of Melbourne, 2025

Assignment type: Group

Review scoring start date: 12am Mon, 26<sup>th</sup> May 2025

Review scoring due date: 11:59pm Wed, 28<sup>th</sup> May 2025

This is the second part of the third assignment, where you need to score the reviews that were written for your team report. You should receive 3–8 reviews, and the reviews are the **same set of reviews** that your teammates receive (in other words, everyone in the team receive the same set of reviews). This is a **group task**, where you should work with your teammates to distribute the reviews evenly among yourselves to score them (this is done for your benefit, so you don't have to score all the reviews by yourself). For example, if your team is a team of 3, and everyone receives 6 reviews, then each member should only need to score 2 reviews. The distribution of the reviews is something that your team should work out; the COMP90042 teaching team will not be involved. **Note that your team must score all reviews** (e.g. using the example above where the team receives 6 reviews, then each review must be scored by at least one member); failure to do so will mean you and your teammates will not receive any marks for assignment 3.

The review scoring will be done in the report submission assignment shell (i.e. the page where you downloaded this review scoring instructions document). You will receive your reviews there. Please follow the instructions on the page to score your reviews. The interface is fairly intuitive but if you have any questions please post them on the discussion board.

## How to Score a Review

You will need to score each review on a scale of 1–10, where 1 = very poor quality review and 10 = great and constructive review. You should score it based on the review writing guideline in the peer review instructions document, given below:

In general, a good quality review should be: objective, constructive and balanced. A review is objective if it analyses each aspect carefully and states the facts. A constructive review does not only state the problems, but also proposes concrete suggestions for improvement — they are constructive because the comments help the reviewee to improve their work. Lastly, a balanced review highlights both the strengths and weaknesses of the work. As the goal of the peer reviewing is to develop evaluative capacity (i.e. capability to judge quality), it is crucial that one develops the ability to assess and identify both good and poor standards of work.

In your review, you should provide 3 types of comments: (1) summary, a short paragraph or two that summarises key methodologies and findings of the report; (2) strengths, aspects that are done well in the report; and (3) weaknesses, issues or problems that need to be improved, and what the improvements are.

You should consider the following aspects or qualities in the report when writing your review:

Component	Criteria	Description
Writing	Clarity	Is the report well-written and well-structured?
	Tables/Figures	Are tables and figures interpretable and used effectively?
Content	Soundness	Are the experiments sound? Are methods justified and used correctly?
	Substance	How much work is done? Is there enough substance?
	Novelty	How novel or ambitious are the techniques or methods?
	Results	Are the results and findings convincing? Are they well articulated?

Note that you can also optionally provide a comment to your score. This is **optional** — it helps explain your score to your reviewer, but is not required for the assignment.