Report Review: Deception For The Greater Good: Minimizing Traffic Congestion With Information Design

Steven Homer[1], Fabian Perez[2], Quinten Rosseel[2] and Matthias Humt[2]

[1]steven.t.homer@gmail.com
[2]{quinten.rosseel, fabian.ramiro.perez.sanjines, matthias.humt}@vub.be

1 EVALUATION

Todo: Short introduction

1.1 INTRODUCTION

Todo: Evaluate whether the introduction explains clearly the content of the paper

1.2 BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Todo: Evaluate whether there is sufficient background information to understand the relevance of the work

1.3 METHODS

Todo: Evaluate whether the methods are clearly explained (can the results be reproduced?)

1.4 RESULTS

Todo: Evaluate whether the results answer the questions asked in the paper (which questions?)

1.5 QUESTIONS

Todo: Evaluate whether all questions asked in the paper are answered (which questions?)

1.6 CONCLUSION

Todo: Evaluate whether the conclusion is sufficient

1.7 STYLE

Todo: Evaluate whether the overall style is ok

1.8 MISSING CONTENT

Todo: Evaluate whether you believe things are missing in the discussion

2 REMARKS

Todo: Short introduction

2.1 POSITIVE

Todo: Name 3 positive points concerning the work, clearly specifying why you think they are well-done or interesting

2.2 NEGATIVE

Todo: Name 3 negative points, which may include missing/unclear explanations or suggestions for improvement

2.3 QUESTIONS

Todo: Name at least 3 clear and relevant questions on the content or the methods used which can be asked (next to other questions)