

## TMIRI assignment: Peer Reviewing

This assignment consists on writing a review for your selected research paper. Let's assume that you are acting as a referee for the conference or journal where the paper was published and your selected paper is assigned to you. You should assess the paper and make your suggestion for acceptance or rejection. Your review should be in accordance with the following template:

- Title of the paper
- Summary. Write in your own words a short summary of the paper (1 or 2 paragraphs is typically enough). The summary must indicate the problem being addressed and in what sense the authors claim that the paper contributes to solving it.
- Write constructive criticism on the following items (a few lines on each):
  - Originality (how original is the work?)
  - Significance/Relevance (why the work is important to others? who are these others?)
  - Validity, including reproducibility of experiments (how well the paper applies the scientific method? how well the experiments support the claim? how good is the logic that links the experiments with the conclusion drawn,...)
  - Scholarship/references (are there references from recent reputable journals and conferences?)
  - Clarity (is the paper well-written, well-structured,...)
  - Suitability for the conference/journal
- Recommendation: (strong reject, weak reject, weak accept, strong accept)
- Level of confidence on your recommendation

**Observation:** I know that you are not a real expert on the topic and you do not know the related literature. You are just pretending to be. Therefore, your evaluation should be mainly based on how credible the claims are. For instance, when you assess the importance of the contribution you have to see if it is supported by a convincing discussion or by convincing references (recent citations of relevant previous work). If you were a true expert, you would include your own opinion based on your expertise. However, good papers should make easy the evaluation even for not-so-expert referees.

**Observation:** As an orientation, conference reviews are often about two pages long.

**Read the following two notes carefully:**

**Delivery:** You have to upload at the RACÒ both the paper and your review (both in pdf). The name of the files must be id-paper.pdf and id-review.pdf, where "id" is your id number (NIF if you are Spanish). Your review should be anonymous. DO NOT PUT YOUR NAME ANYWHERE IN THE DOCUMENT.

**Grading:** For this assignment we will do peer-grading. That means that you will have to grade two of your class-mate assignments. For that purpose, once delivered I will put all of the deliveries in a public folder. Since the name of the pdfs corresponds to the IDs, you can identify your delivery. You will have to read and grade the two submissions that are right after yours in increasing order of ID. Send the grades with a short justification to larrosa@cs.upc.edu