

COMP90042 Assignment 3: Peer Review

Copyright the University of Melbourne, 2021

Peer review start date: 10am Thu, 20th May 2021

Peer review due date: 5pm Fri, 28th May 2021

The peer review is the third and last assignment. Here, you will be assigned **two project reports to review**. The assignment of reports is random, and the review process is double-blind, i.e. the reviewers do not know the identity of the report authors and the report authors likewise do not know the identity of their reviewers.

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

How to Write a Review

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?

Grading

Each review is worth 4.5 marks (total = 9 marks for 2 reviews). All reviews will be checked by the teaching team, and a review will score 4.5 marks unless: (1) no or an empty review is submitted; or (2) the review is of very poor quality. In these two cases 0 mark will be awarded.

A review is judged to be of very poor quality if:

1. There is little substance, e.g. very little is written (< 50 words);
2. The language is unprofessional, e.g. criticisms are overly negative and personal
3. It is unconstructive, e.g. only negative criticisms are given and they are vague and unhelpful.

In general, most reviews will score 4.5 marks. If you've put in some effort to write the review you shouldn't worry. 0 mark is awarded only in exceptional situations where it is very evident that the review is problematic.