如何审稿

一般审稿阅读分三遍：第一遍大致过一遍，有个初步的感觉；第二遍深入阅读；第三遍做标记，给出评语，填写refereeing form。

评语要求：专业性、就事论事

阅读时关注点有下面这些：

- 摘要总结了全文了吗，包括初衷、实验结果、贡献吗？
- 作者在引言里提到的问题都解决了吗？
- 作者提供了足够的背景信息了吗？
- 所有的描述清晰吗？所有的图表清晰吗？有些地方提供图表是不是更便于理解？是不是来个case study会更加便于理解？
- 论文贡献足够清楚吗？贡献有多大的价值？
- 提出的方法解释清楚了吗？得出各个结论有事实支撑吗？
- 给出的公式、算法、方法、实验、结论，是正确、鲁棒、易于理解、有意义的吗？
- 作者表达了论文研究中存在的不足了吗？
- 作者说明了下一步的研究计划了吗？
- 关于引用：是最新的吗？是相关的吗？

范文：

===
REVIEWER #3
===

Detailed Comments

This paper proposed an interesting idea to identify new words in order to boost the word segmentation performance, where it leverages: 1) the n-gram model to calculate the covariance probability of adjacent clusters to extract new words; 2) the left and right information entropy of each candidate word to improve the candidate list; 3) lexical rules to filter out the noise words. The experiments demonstrated the effectiveness of this approach.

This paper is clearly written, which is easy for readers to read and understand the idea, design and discussion. But if the authors can work more from the following perspectives, it can definitely help improve the work:

1. The paper structure is not well established. The framework is mainly described in the "Related Work" session instead of a framework description session.

2. The "Related Work" session is not comprehensive to compare the work proposed in this paper with other approaches.

3. It would be better to introduce the big picture of the framework setup before explaining the detailed steps and algorithms

4. There is no need to explain the well-known or standard formulas/definitions.

5. The "Experiment" session is not very solid. It makes sense to introduce more about the corpora, e.g., number of words, number of segments, new trending words, old words, examples, etc.

6. Should compare this work with other state-of-the-art approaches as baseline systems.

7. Should discuss the strengths and weakness of this work and illustrate by using examples.

8. Many references are ill-formatted in the paper, which brings difficulties for readers to follow the cited work.

9. For several claims in the paper, it's better to associate the related reference work to help understand more about the context.

10. No future work is presented.

Besides, here are a couple of suggestions on the edits:

1. Abstract

"network" -> "the network"
"specific" -> "a specific"
"proposes" -> "propose"

2. Introduction

"computer" -> "a computer"
"sina" -> "Sina"
"borken" -> "a broken"

3. Related Work

"matching" -> "a matching"
"statistic-based" -> "statistical"
"two adjacent words," -> "two adjacent words"

"large-scale" -> "a large-scale"
"starting point," -> "starting point"
"infomation" -> "information"
"sequence" -> "the sequence"
"occuried" -> "occurred"
"frequence" -> "frequency"
"fisrt" -> "first"
"have a certain" -> "has a certain"
"On this basis, in this paper" -> "On this basis, in this paper, "
"entroy" -> "entropy"
"high frequency word" -> "high-frequency word"
"Child parent" -> "Child-parent"
"the field of corpus" -> "the field of the corpus"