

Computing Science – Student Colloquium – Review of Manuscripts

Title of Manuscript: Context Inconsistency Management in Pervasive Systems

Paper id: Set 09

Author(s): Samuel Esposito & Alexander Jurjens

Reviewer(s): Xander Elsas

Please note that the paper you are reviewing is sent to you only for the purpose of this evaluation. The paper is to remain confidential until it is actually published in the conference proceedings. You should not pass it on or disclose it to anyone else. Delegation of the reviewing to someone else is not allowed.

Please indicate grade:

5 = excellent ("Definitely accept the paper w.r.t. this point")

4 = good ("I would argue for accepting the paper w.r.t. this point")

3 = neutral ("Not sure, could go either way the paper w.r.t. this point")

2 = bad ("I would argue against accepting the paper w.r.t. this point")

1 = completely unsatisfactory ("Definitely reject the paper w.r.t. this point")

| General impression | grade | comment/suggestions |
|---|-------|---|
| Is the manuscript properly and coherently structured, and 'easy to navigate'? Are all of the required sections (including abstract, references etc.) present and well-positioned, and are subheadings well-chosen? | 3 | Move the images either to the top of the page or the bottom, but not in the middle of a column. |
| Is the manuscript clearly and concisely written in a proper tone of voice? (please mark sections, sentences, and phrases that are obscure, too complex, ambiguous, too wordy, too vague, that contain redundancies, or that appear to be irrelevant, and words or phrases that do not conform proper English idiom or scientific discourse) Does the document follow the prescribed style, does it give the necessary details in the references, does it generally maintain the proper form (give examples if not)? | 3 | Less use of the colon would improve readability, it disrupts the flow. Only start sentences with conjunctions when it does not disrupt the flow and they are needed. |
| How would you assess the overall quality of the contribution offered in the manuscript in terms of innovativeness, originality, and independent thinking? | 4 | Overall it was an interesting article to read. |

| Framework (initial and final sections) | grade | comment/suggestions |
|--|--------------|--|
| Do title and abstract properly cover the content and the argument of the entire manuscript (including results and discussion/conclusion)? (please mark deficiencies in title and abstract) | 4 | Title and abstract are good as is. |
| Does the introduction cleverly introduce the topic and its importance? Do the authors briefly describe the current state of knowledge about this topic? Do they clearly state the approach they report, or the research problem they address, or the question they intend to answer in the paper, and its relevance? Do they give a brief overview of the entire document? | 3 | The introduction does introduce the topic and what they are going to discuss, but not why it is important. |
| Does the concluding section (summary/conclusion/discussion) actually address the approach/problem/question stated in the introduction? Do the authors clearly indicate the significance of their findings for the state of knowledge in the field? Do they assess their own approach to the problem? Do they suggest future directions or directions? | 4 | The conclusion does address the approach stated in the introduction |

| Core sections of manuscript | grade | comment/suggestions |
|--|--------------|---|
| Are the authors clear, complete, concise and coherent in their overview of the current state of knowledge regarding the topic addressed in the manuscript? | 4 | The current state of knowledge is made clear right at the introduction and in section 2. |
| Are the authors clear, complete, concise and coherent in their account of their own approach of the topic? Is this approach well-chosen? | 4 | The article is coherent and clear in the topic they're addressing. |
| Have the authors provided sufficient methodological detail about their approach? | 4 | With some really minor adjustments to the figures (make them less crowded!) the article is good. |
| Have the authors been fair and explicit in their use and treatment of previous literature and the work of others (including visuals)? Are references in the text mentioned according to the criteria current in the field? Is the list of references complete and correct? | 4 | All the figures have a source listed. |
| Have the authors made clever and proper use of illustrations? | 2 | The figures make the text harder to navigate because of their positioning. Some figures are rather crowded. |

| Acceptance | |
|---|--|
| What is your overall grade for the paper? | 5 = excellent, "Definitely accept the paper" |
| | 4 = good, "I would argue for accepting the paper" |
| | 3 = neutral, "Not sure, could go either way" |
| Should the paper be accepted for the studColl conference? | 2 = bad, "I would argue against accepting the paper" |
| | 1 = completely unsatisfactory, "Definitely reject the paper" |
| (encircle what is appropriate) | 3 |

| |
|---|
| Further comments or suggestions |
| <p>The overall impression of the article is good. I'm giving this a 3 now, but with some minor adjustments this could easily become a 4 or a 5.</p> |