CSCI8380 (Spring 2012): Paper Review Form

Reviewer Name: Mehdi Allahyari

Paper Name: Information credibility on twitter

Section I. Overview

A. Reader Interest

1. Which category describes this manuscript?
   __Practice/Application/Case Study/Experience Report
   __✔__Research/Technology
   ___Survey/Tutorial/How-To

B. Content

1. Please explain how this manuscript advances this field of research and/or contributes something new to the literature.

Answer: This manuscript describes a precise analysis on information credibility of news propagated by Twitter. They also concentrate on automatic methods for assessing the credibility of a given set of tweets, and examine the postings on related to "trending" topics and classify them based as credible or not credible.

C. Presentation

1. Does the introduction state the objectives of the manuscript in terms that encourage the reader to read on?
   __✔_Yes
   ___Could be improved
   ___No

2. How would you rate the organization of the manuscript? Is it focused? Is the length appropriate for the topic?
   __✔_Satisfactory
   ___Could be improved
   ___Poor

3. Please rate and comment on the readability of this manuscript.
   _✔__Easy to read
   ___Readable - but requires some effort to understand
   ___Difficult to read and understand
   ___Unreadable

Section II. Evaluation

Please rate the manuscript. Explain your choice.

___Award Quality
___Excellent
_✔_Good
___Fair
___Poor

Section III. Detailed Comments (provide your thoughts/criticism about the ideas in the paper; not only summarize the paper but have a critical look here)

Answer: *In this paper authors showed that for messages about time-sensitive topics, it's possible to separate automatically newsworthy topics from other types of conversations. They also expressed how to assess automatically the level of social media credibility of newsworthy topics.*

Additional Comments:
1. Provide one aspect that you liked the most in this paper.

   Doing analysis on Twitter, as one of the most important micro blogging services is worthwhile and a great idea.

2. Provide one aspect that you disliked the most in this paper.

   The evaluations done were quite limited. There are lots of figures without explanation.
   There are a number of good machine learning algorithms they could use to improve their performance.

Section IV. Discussion Points (provide at least 3 discussion topics/questions related to ideas/techniques described in the paper; these will be used for discussions in the class)

   1. *How did they use ontologies in their analysis?*
   2. *How they have done feature selection for doing the credibility analysis?*